

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 28 September 1989

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

## IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act 1930. Read a first time.

The **Hon. P.B. ARNOLD**: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

In 1987, the Liberal Opposition successfully amended the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act to enable a person who has applied to the Minister for an extension of a water main or sewer and who is dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate of cost to arrange for the work to be carried out by a person of his or her choice. Likewise, ratepayers within Government irrigation areas find it necessary from time to time to apply to the E&WS Department for new connections and extensions to irrigation mains, usually as a result of property subdivision. Therefore irrigation ratepayers should be given the same opportunity to have the work undertaken by a competent contractor if they are dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate of cost.

No-one is suggesting that the quality of work being undertaken by the E&WS Department is in any way superior or inferior to that undertaken by the private sector, but obviously the work must be undertaken at the best price if we are serious about containing costs. We are saying that, because of competition, in many instances the private sector can carry out exactly the same work to the same standard as that required by the E&WS Department, but in many cases for less than half the cost. When we are talking about thousands of dollars for an individual family in new connections having to be made, it becomes a very significant amount. Therefore, the purpose of this legislation is to enable the ratepayer to have that work undertaken at the lowest possible cost. Numerous examples can be cited in the Riverland where private irrigation contractors have been prepared to undertake the work on behalf of irrigators for thousands of dollars less than that quoted by the department on behalf of the Minister.

Clause 2, the operative clause, sets out the requirements that I am seeking to have placed within the Irrigation Act. The legislation will enable irrigators to receive the same benefits as those people in the community presently coming under the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## WELFARE CUTS

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright)** I move:

That this House calls on the State Leader of the Opposition to clarify his attitude to the welfare cuts proposed by his Federal coalition colleagues.

I believe that the people of South Australia deserve some sort of clarification of this issue. Members opposite have been ducking and weaving for long enough on the issue of where they stand on cuts to social security and other support measures for the less economically advantaged people in our society. Earlier this year, when polls—I presume of both

Parties—were showing that the Labor Party was not selling itself very well on the issue of welfare, the Opposition smelled an opportunity. It came out with a rather sickening display of phoney concern for the welfare of working people. Fortunately for most of those who watched the process, it did not last very long. The polls very quickly showed that no-one out in the electorate actually believed the Opposition; no-one was conned or sucked in by this phoney display of concern for ordinary people. Basically, the Opposition gave it up as a bad loss. It was not getting anywhere so it simply tossed it over the side—another disposable policy.

The Opposition cannot even spell the word 'compassion', much less convince the electorate that it is capable of demonstrating it. The questions that South Australians might ask themselves are, 'Why was the Opposition so singularly unsuccessful at selling the people of this State on the idea that it could display genuine compassion for ordinary people? Why was the Opposition's 'Project Compassion' such a dismal failure?' I must conclude that it was not just Friar Tuck and his band of merry men, because members opposite had the help of people in Canberra. We need to look at what the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Andrew Peacock) had to say about welfare spending. Mr Peacock's two lists of spending cuts were announced in a large article by Milton Cockburn in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 26 July. The article states:

The Federal Opposition has decided not to release all its proposed spending cuts when it outlines its taxation and expenditure policies after next month's budget. It has decided instead to draw up two lists of spending cuts: one for public release and another, detailing more severe cuts which, will be kept secret.

The article went on to say:

Key shadow Ministers have decided this is preferable to the Opposition revealing all its cards now and finding itself the target of disaffected interest groups which will be hurt by the proposed cuts.

An interesting twist to this article is that several shadow Ministers were called in by Dr John Hewson and were taken through, 'line by line' (as the article states), possible spending cuts to their portfolios. One shadow Minister is reputed to have found that, as he was in a low spending portfolio, he did not need to make as many cuts. Although he had found two pages of cuts, he promptly dropped the second page into his bag in the hope that Dr Hewson would let him keep a little more money. The following day, the same correspondent had another article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* under the heading 'Peacock makes no promises over cuts' in which he said—

**Mr Duigan**: A promise to make no promises?

**Mr ROBERTSON**: A promise to make no promises—at least there is consistency in that. In an address to Fairfax executives in Sydney on 18 July, Mr Peacock told the luncheon that the Opposition would not be releasing all the details of its proposed spending cuts before the election.

*Mr Duigan interjecting:*

**Mr ROBERTSON**: Exactly. He said, 'We promise to tell you nothing. We promise to keep you in the dark.' It is the mushroom philosophy for which the Liberals have become famous. The article continues:

He [Mr Peacock] told the luncheon there would be two lists of spending cuts: one which would be released before the election and one which would be kept secret. Mr Peacock said the second list of more detailed cuts would only be implemented if a coalition Government found conditions to be worse than anticipated.

They will never get the chance, of course, to find out whether conditions are worse than they anticipated, because I suggest they will never win, so the second list may never be revealed. It is interesting to note how much support Mr Peacock had for his stand and what the economic whiz-kid, the Ferrari driving John Hewson, had to say about that. In an article two months earlier in the *Advertiser* of 29 May,

John Hewson in fact foreshadowed Andrew Peacock's hit list. Under the heading of 'Coalition plans big welfare cuts' the article stated:

The Opposition treasury spokesman, Dr Hewson, has foreshadowed major social welfare spending cuts under a coalition Government. 'We spend \$25 billion a year on social security and welfare alone,' he said. 'I mean, how many genuine needy people are there?'

That seems to be the Liberals' attitude: how many needy people are there? Cut them off at the pass; do not pay; make everyone justify every single cent you give them! What can we expect from a shadow Treasurer who drives a Ferrari? Like Nigel Mansell, he should have been black-flagged some time ago. For your benefit, Mr Speaker, I am leaving MGBs out of it.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair appreciates the consideration of the honourable member.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** He wants to do to the economy what Nigel Mansell did to Ayrton Senna on Sunday night. I must turn to what the other economic gurus had to say—and there are plenty in the Opposition camp. We have another giant: the brains behind the 'Joh for PM' campaign, one John Stone, former employee of the Treasury.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Not a good one, one has to say, but still, for the Treasury, desperate times deserve desperate measures. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 17 July, Mr Stone started the assault on the welfare system. The article was written under the Canberra by-line of Paul Willoughby and states:

The spectre of significant cuts in welfare spending has been raised by the Opposition finance spokesman, Senator John Stone. He said much of Australia's economic problems had been caused by the fact that the country was now 'really a welfare State'. He foreshadowed increased economic pain—including the possibility of large welfare cuts—under a coalition Government.

Mr Stone was never one to pull punches—talk about casting the first stone! Senator Stone always shoots from the lip. Further, the article states:

Senator Stone called for further cuts in Government spending, saying there was 'a great deal of fat to be cut away from the budget.'

I would like Senator Stone to go out and tell people in my electorate or, indeed, in any other just where this fat could be cut out of the budget. I contend that there is not a great deal of fat there and, if he had an ounce of compassion, he would know about it.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROBERTSON:** A lot of it could be cut away from the maintenance fund for the Ferrari and from John Stone's Treasury superannuation cheque. The article went on:

He said a coalition Government would make spending cuts 'more substantial than \$1 billion'.

I defy anyone to find \$1 billion worth of spending cuts in the Australian welfare budget. On the same day the *Adelaide News* carried an article which indicated what people in the community are saying about the attitude of Mr Stone and his cronies. This response is from Mr Bernard Lord of the Australian Retired Persons' Association, who put the argument against the Stone line more succinctly than most of us are probably capable of doing. The article, under a Melbourne by-line in the *News* of 17 July, states:

A national pensioner group today called on Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Peacock, to immediately clarify Opposition policies for the aged.

The article quoted Mr Lord as follows:

Senator Stone's comments are just one more example of the plight of pensioners being used as a political football to suit the electioneering tactics of the political Parties.

The political Party that Mr Lord had in mind in this case is clearly the Liberal Party. He went on to state:

What politicians do not realise is that every time they start speculating on the future of pensioners and older Australians, they add to the uncertainty and concern of a group of Australians least able to defend themselves.

I can only say, 'Hear, hear!' Of course they do. It is the most vulnerable section of Australian society; the most insecure section of Australian society. And Stone, Hewson, Peacock and Elliott have been sniping away at that group for the greater part of this year.

I would now like to turn to what that other luminary of hard-line Liberalism had to say. The Liberal Party's policy was probably most clearly articulated by the Party's Federal President, one John Elliott. Elliott is a man who has everything that the ordinary bloke could aspire to: he has his own brewery, he has his own football-team, and one could ask how Carlton went this year, but I am too polite to do so—and Mr Elliott has his own retreat on the Cote d'Azur, I am told. While people in Australia are worrying about the cost of living, he is worrying about the Costa Brava.

**Mr Tyler:** He has his own private jet.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Yes, he has his own private jet. He has everything laid on, yet he talks for the ordinary person in Australia! I refer to an article by Paul Austin in the *Australian* of 27 July 1989 about Mr Elliott delivering the Dame Enid Lyons Memorial lecture at the Australian National University. I quote from the article, as follows:

A future Peacock Government would take tough decisions on welfare cuts, the Federal President of the Liberal Party, Mr John Elliott, said yesterday

I will quote extensively from this article, because it is a succinct statement about what the Liberal Party is all about. The article continues:

Mr Elliott said the Liberal Party's position was that there were probably too many people dependant on the welfare system and 'That'll have to be changed.' About 30 per cent of the population received some form of Government hand-out and people had the mentality that 'basically we deserve a piece of the welfare cake'.

**Mr Hamilton:** It does not talk about big business with its hands out.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** No; they have their hands in many places. The report continues:

Free health care and dole payments without the requirement of work were evidence of 'this malaise that Government knows best'.

Mr Elliott went on to say:

All these things seem to have been enshrined in the past 20 years in our philosophy and way of life.

I go on to quote Mr Elliott, who states:

It's no wonder we're falling behind, because there's nowhere else in the world where that is enshrined. In my view, we've got to reset the values of the system in this country.

This is pretty hard stuff if one happens to be poor, or a single parent, or old, or without enough money to meet the costs of living.

**Mr Hamilton:** Or disabled!

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Indeed, disabled, or in the position of children, single parents, or pensioners. The most vulnerable sections of society are having their collective and individual pants scared off by Mr Elliott and his like.

**Mr Tyler:** He also said that Mr Peacock knows what needs to be done.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Yes, he said that Mr Peacock knows what needs to be done, but the question is, 'Who is pulling whose strings?' I suggest, that Mr Elliott is pulling most of the strings. In the article, Mr Elliott goes on to state:

... there will, of course, be pain for some of us as one takes away some of the welfare shackles, and we support causes—this is interesting, 'we' being the Liberal Party—

that are going to improve the productivity and living standards of our citizens overall.

By 'citizens overall' he means his own supporters who are being helped in no small measure by the sorts of policies they are advocating. The Liberal Party is not concerned about the statistical tail in Australian society who are badly off. In the view of Mr Elliott and his cohorts, they are unproductive and do not count. They are the ones from whom the welfare shackles will be removed. Presumably, they will be allowed to sink under their own weight.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** It's economic euthanasia.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** As the Minister says, it is economic euthanasia—put them out of their misery. The arguments of all the aforementioned luminaries are best summed up by our Minister of Health (Hon. Don Hopgood) who put out a press release in response to Mr Elliott and Mr Peacock. I quote from the press release of Dr Hopgood, as follows:

The Greiner Liberal Government in New South Wales has shown the way the Liberals would go by slashing hospital and welfare services.

Of course, I could add to that the 3 000 teachers who have found themselves in the street since Greiner and his economic henchman Dr Metherell have taken charge of the education system in that State. It seems that 3 000 teachers cannot be wrong.

**Mr Hamilton:** What about transport?

**Mr ROBERTSON:** As the member for Albert Park asks, what about transport: public transport, public hospitals, public education and welfare services. Dr Hopgood continues:

What the Liberals will effectively do is to create a permanent poor class in Australia as Margaret Thatcher has done in Britain. I do not need to explain to you, Mr Speaker, the significance of the poll tax in Britain, which would be the most regressive form of local taxation anywhere in the world. The poor are slogged for six because they happen to have many children or because, unlike the rich, they cannot afford a roof over each head. The Costa Bravas, the John Elliotts and the single person households do very well in Margaret Thatcher's Britain. If you happen to be black, poor, have five or six kids, or two or three families under your roof, you pay a poll tax. If you have 10 people under your roof you pay 10 times what the millionaire pays in the inner London area.

**An honourable member:** The silver tails territory.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** In this silver tail territory, one person-one house-one poll is one lot of tax; 10 people in one house—whether children, poor or single parents, West Indians, Pakistanis—pay in proportion to that. It is simply not fair. Margaret Thatcher is the exponent of that, and is arguably the best in the world at it. I hope that the Liberals in this country do not want to go that far with their monetarism and their free marketing economy. Dr Hopgood continued:

This is the price they argue—

that is the Liberal Party—

that Australia must endure if the Elliotts and Peacocks want to maintain their welfare and power.

I can only say, 'Hear, hear'. It is all about Elliott and Peacock maintaining wealth and power. That is what the Liberal Party is about—looking after those who have the money and are determined like hell to hang on to it. This phoney Prague spring we saw from them some time ago, this phoney concern for welfare, stopped as quickly as it started. The Liberals meant to go nowhere; they did not convince anyone in the polls; and the South Australian electorate justifiably rejected them and, I dare say, will do so again.

What the electorate in South Australia wants to see is the comparative performance between Labor and the threatened performance of members opposite. The electorate can compare the record of Labor Governments in this country—1.5 million new jobs created since 1983; and South Australia with the fastest growing youth employment sector in the country. That is what this Party is all about—spreading the opportunity and wealth and making it easier for those who are up against it. We are not concerned about the Liberals' phoney concern for welfare.

Members opposite have threatened to scrap the assets test, fringe benefits tax, Medicare, public schools, public transport, and pension rises which, for the first time in this country, have brought the pensioners of Australia to a point where they can live with a degree of dignity on a pension that is slightly more than 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. The Liberals want to reverse that and take us back to the nineteenth century. What else will they take away—family allowances, transport concessions that the Government gave to people over 60 years old.

*The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is interjecting out of his seat.

**Mr ROBERTSON:** South Australians know better than to trust this mob. South Australians know that members opposite will be defeated, rejected and humiliated and returned to the wilderness where they so thoroughly deserve to be.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I move:

That this House recommends that the Government advise the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications that the curfew hours of 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. at Adelaide Airport be retained indefinitely and that jet aircraft movements be permitted during those hours only in cases of emergency.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** I bet the noise is worrying you at present!

**Mr BECKER:** I thank the member for Heysen for that interjection. It is peaceful in the electorates of Hanson and Peake and the surrounding areas because of the pilots strike.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** The lives of those who live around the Adelaide Airport will never be the same again. It is about time that the Government, local government and the people of South Australia realised the impact that the pilots strike still has on air transport in Australia. The Annual Report for News Limited for the year ended 30 June 1989 contains part of the reason for the pilots strike, because Ansett Transport Industries which is 50 per cent owned by the News Corporation and TNT, last year found it very tough, its contribution to profit falling from \$92.9 million in 1988 to \$16.9 million. Thereby hangs a tale.

Back in the early 1970s, when at Adelaide Airport, jet aircraft took over from the piston operating aircraft, there was a noticeable difference in the noise emitted by the aircraft. The residents living around the Adelaide Airport, many of them having lived there before the airport was built, had come to tolerate the movement of aircraft in and out of Adelaide Airport. The piston driven aircraft (DC-3s and Viscounts) lumbered in and out of Adelaide Airport and life was reasonably peaceful. A curfew arrangement had always applied from about 10 p.m. to about 6 a.m., but

there was and still is nothing in writing or legally binding in relation to the curfew.

Then the two airline companies purchased DC-9 aircraft and 727s. These jet aircraft, particularly the DC-9, are quite loud; the decibel readings far exceed normal noise levels permitted in the work place, let alone in a residential area. During the day, because of the background noise of traffic, general household activities and business and commercial activities, the noise is not as noticeable, but those people who live under the flight path that comes down to Adelaide Airport through North Adelaide or the suburbs of Mile End, Thebarton and Brooklyn Park, or under the flight path over Glenelg and Glenelg North, have come to accept to some degree the level of noise involved in the operation of the airport. The busiest times are about 6.30 a.m. and just before 9 a.m., around midday, late in the afternoon, around 5 p.m., and the last planes finish at about 9 p.m.

So, we put up with this for some time until we again protested to the Federal Government authorities—in those days, the Liberal Government—and, with the sanction of the Minister of Aviation as it was then, an agreement was reached that no commercial aircraft would operate in or out of Adelaide Airport between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. That agreement was adhered to for many months. Occasionally, en route from Perth, a 727 would arrive in cases of emergency when a passenger had suffered from some serious illness on the flight. I think that on one occasion somebody was giving birth prematurely and the plane was directed to Adelaide.

On those occasions when the curfew was broken, if the reason was given immediately, and particularly if it involved a health matter, that was acceptable. However, we found that it was becoming a regular occurrence, so it was necessary to reinforce with the Government and Minister of the day that residents in the area would not tolerate breaking the curfew. Having formed the South-Western Suburbs Environmental Association, of which Dr Reece Jennings was Secretary and I was President, we had several meetings and were quite successful in negotiating curfew hours with the then Government and management of Adelaide Airport. The Anti-Airport Noise Association was formed by one of the local councillors purely for council election purposes. A wide group of people through those council areas of Thebarton, West Torrens, Henley and Grange and Glenelg were concerned about the residential environment and noise coming from Adelaide Airport.

We were further able to get from the airline companies a projection detail of a wide bodied and quieter aircraft. Whether it be the Adelaide Airport or any other airport in Australia, Europe or America, all cities suffer a similar problem. No matter where we relocate or develop an airport, a residential development takes place in the vicinity. I recall in 1981 going to Frankfurt to look at its airport, which had been redeveloped and resited because of complaints from residents living around the airport who were merely to find that it had been moved out a few kilometres from the old airport. Most of it had been completed, and applications and requests for housing and planning subdivisions were being received by the various local authorities. The authorities had failed to build a buffer zone of any size around that airport. Wherever you go in the world the problem is the same.

The demand and requests are there for airline companies to purchase aircraft that are much quieter. The challenge also is there for aircraft manufacturers to design aircraft that require only short runways and to introduce quieter, more fuel efficient engines. Australian Airlines, which has purchased the airbus or A300, and Ansett, which has the

737 and 767 similar to Qantas aircraft, are conscious of the problem of airport and aircraft noise and its impact on the environment. I understand that those companies planned to phase out the DC9 and 727 by the end of this calendar year, so that by 1 January Adelaide Airport should see only the wide bodied, quieter aircraft. The airline pilots dispute could well cause problems and the airlines might not now meet that program, although I sincerely hope that they will.

There is no doubt that with the airlines dispute, the companies will have to rethink their policies and economics. We can already see that, with the promise of deregulation of the domestic airline system, many changes will occur. Of course, with those changes will come the need for greater efficiency and production: even if the pilots are anywhere near successful with their push for higher salaries, it is acknowledged that there will be a huge push for greater productivity.

The only way to achieve that is by cutting back on a very efficient system that we have in Australia. The first area that will suffer will be safety. Secondly, it will be necessary to fly those aircraft 24 hours a day. I can remember in the early 1970s corresponding with the late Sir Reginald Ansett, whom I found most helpful in trying to solve any problems involving Adelaide Airport. The information I received from his officers from time to time was that it was necessary to operate an airline company like a transport company, a bus company, or a company involved in any other motorised form of transport: the equipment had to be operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Further, the curfews applying at the various airports around Australia were causing a tremendous amount of handicap and hardship for an airline company to operate effectively and efficiently.

As far as I am concerned—and as far as the vast majority of residents living around Adelaide Airport are concerned—I do not accept that. We believe that the airline companies have the luxury of using an airport so close to the centre of the city in a major developing State and that certain costs must be involved. One of those costs is the necessity to observe the curfew hours. Unfortunately, as sometimes happens just before a council or State election, a few radicals pop out of the woodwork in the guise of community development people or whatever they are (when one does a bit of homework, one usually finds that they are Democrats) trying to scare everyone into believing that an aircraft will take off from the Adelaide Airport and crash into Thebarton or Mile End.

I suppose, on the law of averages, the chances of that happening are increasing. However, if we insist on the airline companies and airport management maintaining the strict safety standards that have been enforced over the years, I do not think there is much chance of a major accident happening near the city or Adelaide Airport. A light aircraft did come in one night and just failed to clear the fence before landing. It was found that that aircraft was in trouble and that the controllers and those responsible for guiding it into Adelaide Airport should have made it fly into the airport boundary and around the airport before attempting an emergency landing but, unfortunately, that did not happen.

Those are the sort of things one learns about after the event. Fortunately, there were no serious injuries or damage. However, it highlights the problems that can arise when a busy interstate and international airport is also used for the operation of light aircraft. The only light aircraft now using Adelaide Airport are, in the main, those of the commercial operators. Problems have arisen with the advent of the international airport. Earlier this year the Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, was reported in the press as

saying that the curfew hours at Adelaide Airport should be extended. During the budget Estimates Committees, I took the opportunity to question the Minister over her statement, because it had caused a tremendous amount of anxiety in my electorate and surrounding suburbs. Everyone believed—this came through the media—that the South Australian Minister of Tourism was advocating breaking the curfew hours.

This arrangement has existed for many years. As I have said, this could prompt a few radicals who will jump on anything to see this as an issue that they could raise for political purposes. The Minister explained that she was advocating that, if an international flight coming in from Singapore to Adelaide Airport, which flight may have originated in London, was one, two or three hours behind schedule, through no fault of the operator but through delays and weather conditions along the route, that aircraft should be given approval to come in and land. It has happened on one or two occasions, where an international aircraft has come in in the early hours of the morning. To my knowledge, on those occasions there have been no complaints. The 747 (the jumbo, as we know it) is much quieter than a DC9 and the 727.

However, we are not prepared to accept that international airlines should be allowed to come in willy-nilly and abuse the privilege of our curfew system. We are not prepared to accept that they have the right, in the name of tourism and the holy tourist dollar, to abuse the privileges involved in breaking those curfew hours. Each airline company knows that a curfew operates at Adelaide Airport, as is the case at various other airports, including the busiest in Australia, Sydney International Airport. If the airlines can maintain their schedules and organise their flights and, if necessary, reschedule their flights, in order that they come in at the appropriate time, why can they not do it in relation to Adelaide Airport? This is the argument. Unfortunately, this is the situation that has been created by the Minister of Tourism's advocating the breaking of the curfew hours. It is simply not on. It will not be accepted by the residents in the area or by the local councils. In particular, Thebarton council is adamant that the curfew hours at Adelaide Airport must be strictly maintained.

A few years ago the airport management received several requests from courier services to operate small commercial jet aircraft in and out of Adelaide Airport. One company was given a trial for six months. The plane would bring in computer paper at about 4 o'clock in the morning and would then fly on to Perth. Nobody complained. Then, when the regular flights started we received several complaints, but unfortunately it was too late.

The reason for this appeal to the House and the protest to the Commonwealth Government relates simply to a matter of principle. Once we give in, once we allow a small chink in the arrangements, once we allow a precedent, no matter how small it is or how infrequent it may be, we will find that it will spread. Once we allow the opportunity for British Airways, Singapore Airlines, Malaysian Airlines, Thai Airways, or whoever, to break the curfew hours at Adelaide Airport, soon after we will have Ansett doing it—because Abeles does not give a damn about anyone—and then Australian Airlines will have to follow suit.

This all relates to the principle of preserving and protecting the curfew arrangement that we have at Adelaide Airport. I have always believed that we won that, and won it well under the Liberal Government. The arrangement has been upheld by Labor Governments, and I believe that we should fight, as is our right, to maintain a suitable residen-

tial environment surrounding Adelaide Airport. I commend the motion to the House.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### FLORA AND FAUNA PROTECTION

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I move:

That this House expresses its support for legislation similar in purpose to the Victorian Parliament's Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act 1988 which recognises the protection of endangered species and endorses the formation of a select committee to inquire into that legislation and similar provisions in other like legislation for the purpose of presenting such a Bill to the House at the earliest available opportunity.

The motion contains a number of sections. First and foremost, it calls upon the House to express support for an action which I believe is the desire of members of all political persuasions and certainly members on both sides of the House. Members on both sides of the House have consistently paid lip service to a number of these issues and approved of them. To this point little has come forward by way of direct action, so this motion gives the House an opportunity, first and foremost, to agree to put into action what members, throughout the parliamentary system in this State, have been saying for quite some time.

The second section to which I draw attention is the phrase 'similar in purpose'. I use that phrase because I believe it is absolutely essential that this State, in framing its legislation, take heed of that which has been discussed at conferences of Ministers and adapt it to the existing law in this State. In a number of circumstances, if we follow the provisions which exist in the Victorian legislation, it will be necessary to repeal other Acts of Parliament and have one piece of legislation.

One of the purposes of this whole exercise is to coordinate a series of provisions which currently exist in a number of Acts of this State and incorporate them in one piece of legislation so that it is possible to understand clearly what to do in respect of our flora and fauna, its preservation and its advancement (if that proves to be necessary). We can do that by having one Act rather than a number of pieces of legislation. We are looking at 'similar in purpose' to the Victorian legislation, but we are not tying ourselves to its final purpose so as to give us the opportunity to find a better way of building the mouse-trap, as it were.

I believe that Victoria is justly proud of this legislation, which is a first for this State. We are not the first to put this legislation forward, but I hope that with another feature of the Bill, to which I will refer later, we will put forward legislation which is a first in Australia for its extent and for the benefit to this State. In fact, I believe that, in due course, it will be a yardstick or guiding light for legislation elsewhere. The third section of the motion refers to the importance of the protection of endangered species. There are a number of endangered species of both flora and fauna.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** On which side of the House?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am talking not of the two-legged human kind but the animals, birds and flora. So important is it that I commend the Minister for Environment and Planning for taking this as her particular theme when she addressed the annual dinner of the Wildlife Council, which met at Reynella in South Australia two weeks ago. She traced the history of the problems in Australia and, more specifically, in South Australia. She highlighted the problems that have emerged and the number of species

that no longer exist. She also highlighted the fact that, unless we take positive action, a number of endangered species will become extinct. This motion recognises the fact that, as South Australians, we urgently desire to ensure the protection of various species.

The motion then calls for the endorsement of the formation of a select committee. I have suggested the formation of a select committee because, as a result of statements made in the community over some period, I believe we have bipartisan support for such legislation. For many years I have believed that legislation that has the benefit of consideration by a select committee is better understood, accepted and appreciated as a result of the bipartisan input and the fact that all matters relating to it have been thoroughly canvassed.

In addition, such investigation can be a continuing process over whatever period is required so that other legislation in not only Australia but also elsewhere in the world can be investigated. I do not suggest that the committee should travel to other parts of the world to look at appropriate legislation, but it is not impossible to obtain copies of legislation and even to seek representations from other people and bodies overseas. Many conservation-based groups exist in Australia and many of them have active branches in South Australia. I have no doubt that those branches would assist in presenting worthwhile information before a select committee.

The select committee is charged with the last part of the motion, that is, the preparation of a Bill which can be duly considered by the two Houses of Parliament in South Australia and leading to its enactment. I have taken some pains to pinpoint the fact that this motion can be clearly divided into a number of parts, all of which I believe flow one from the other and all of which I believe are necessary if South Australia is to benefit from another State's existing legislation and that is also contemplated by other States. It certainly is in line with a number of announcements made by the Federal Government about matters directly associated with the well-being of Australia and its environment. In fact, this issue has been brought under the environmental umbrella.

I will now outline some aspects of the Victorian legislation so that members have a better understanding of what action has been taken in that State that could be considered in relation to South Australia. In moving the Bill in the Legislative Council of the Victorian Parliament, the Minister for Conservation, Forests and Lands (Hon. J.E. Kirner) stated:

The Purpose of the Legislation.

This Bill provides for the enactment of a landmark piece of conservation legislation—for a flora and fauna guarantee. Two lifetimes are all it has taken to change the face of Victoria.

Indeed, we could say 'the face of South Australia', as the Minister indicated to the meeting of the Wildlife Council there is evidence that even less than one generation has been responsible for the further demise of a number of species in this State. So, it is not only a matter of value to the Victorian scene. The Minister continues:

In that short interlude a land of forests and woodlands, wetlands, heaths and grasslands, teeming with wildlife, has been transformed.

Again, we could say that is the same situation which exists in South Australia and is the basis for the new park management agreements which are being formulated to offset the degradation taking place in a number of our national parks and recreational parks. If one heeds the action most recently taken in the Innamincka and Coopers Creek area, one notes that on the one hand a number of people are saying that they are prepared to pay for access so long as

the money is returned to the proper assessment of the needs of those parks, while on the other hand others are saying that they do not want to pay to go into their own parks but want to be able to do their own thing and take whatever action suits them, regardless of the long-term benefits for the State. That is another issue which would be embraced in this overall approach to preservation because, without a management policy, without positive action being taken to prevent people who would desecrate or degradate parks and land, increasingly our existing species which may now be in abundance would become endangered in the longer term.

I would not want it thought that, in my making that generalised statement, I believe that every species designated as endangered in the minds of some groups are actually endangered. In some cases, a species may be endangered in a particular habitat but not in total, so legislation such as this should put the situation into proper context on a South Australian basis and, subsequently, with the cooperation of the Ministers' council and the States, on a global basis. It must be recognised that a number of species, particularly bird life, migrate from South Australia to other countries, moving backwards and forwards each year: my remarks relate to the global scene, not just South Australia or Australia. The Victorian Minister continued:

What seemed to be a boundless expanse was opened up to yield its riches. But we did not always treat the land well. We have discovered that there are limits to how hard it can be pressed, and the signs of stress are now clearly evident through the erosion of soils, the spread of salinity and pest plants and animals, and through the steady decline of our wild animals and our native vegetation.

In that expression, she is picking up a number of the aspects of the overall approach to the environment and land management embraced in legislation quite recently before this House, that is, the pastoral and soil conservation legislation. Indeed, the integrated effort that is necessary on a total basis across the State becomes even more evident when one realises that these issues cannot be taken in isolation, hence the importance of making sure that, whatever is contained in that various legislation, has a firm basis in one and allows the matter to be put beyond any question by people who would dodge from one department to another or from one piece of legislation to another to try to find flaws or loopholes. That again is one of the major thrusts of the legislation that has been enacted in Victoria.

The other aspect that I pick up from the Victorian Minister's introduction, in referring to the purpose of the legislation, comes in the third paragraph at page 921 of the Victorian report for 21 April 1988:

This change of heart has come none to soon, however, because our native species are in peril. In fact, they face the greatest threat to their survival that has occurred in the whole history of evolution. Our records show that at least 20 species of mammals, two species of birds and 35 species of vascular plants have vanished from Victoria in the space of 150 years. Furthermore, at least 700 native species are threatened right now. This means that about one in five of all the native vertebrate animals and vascular plants still living in Victoria is facing the prospect of extinction. This is not a situation that any section of the community believes should be allowed to continue.

I believe that in that statement the Minister was reflecting the information that has been forthcoming by the lip services, to which I referred earlier, of political Parties of all persuasions that now is the time to draw together the good will that exists and to give urgent consideration to the matter that is before us.

However, let us look at the content of the Bill which would bring into being the legislation for flora and fauna guarantee in South Australia. I should point out that this matter requires a great number of resources, and those resources are mainly financial. Hence, if any member oppo-

site or anybody taking an interest in the debate should ask why I brought this matter to the House in the form of a motion rather than a Bill, my answer would be that to bring it forward in Bill form would require a great deal of discussion and acceptance by the Government of money clauses, and that is better done with the full cooperation of the Government rather than have it try to tack on the necessary resource implications after a Bill which was deficient in that regard was considered by the House. So we have to accept that there are resources involved and that the Government commitment will be required. Clearly, such a commitment would be forthcoming from a Liberal Government, and there would have to be an increasing financial commitment over several years until it was well in place.

However, I go one step further and say that, as in Victoria, even though the legislation has been in place for only a short time, the fact that this form of legislation exists gives an impetus to a number of corporate sponsors to make funds available, to work in concert with the Government of the day and to enhance the values of the country in which we live. From the discussions that I have had with a number of interested bodies and from talking in general terms with corporate management in this State, I feel sure that they would see the opportunity mutually to benefit their operations in a number of areas and the environment of South Australia in the thrust of the legislation that we are considering. The Victorian report also states:

The Bill establishes clear objectives, including the aim to guarantee all Victoria's taxa of native flora and fauna, other than those expressly excluded can survive, flourish and maintain their potential for evolutionary development in the wild. A taxon is a taxonomic group, such as a species.

The Bill will formally establish a Scientific Advisory Committee. The committee's primary task is to advise the Minister on the purely technical question of whether a species or a community of flora and fauna is threatened and whether a particular process is really a threat. A secondary task is to provide management advice to the Minister and Director-General, which would be considered along with advice from other sources. A formal process involving public participation, is set out for determining the listing or delisting of taxa, communities and potentially threatening processes. There is also a requirement that as soon as possible after a listing an action statement be prepared.

Two or three things come from that early indication from the Victorian Minister of the intention of the Bill. It calls for community based activity. There need to be very clear indications that certain practices, which have existed for years, are not necessarily bad practices, but some of them may need a degree of fine tuning. In fact, some of them may be called into question and, over time, with evidence and with a proper approach involving full consultation, may lead to a variation.

Land management, as such, is a new technology in a scientific sense that has existed since man first started farming and, in a technical sense, it has been taken up by tertiary institutions, in particular, in degrees and diplomas that specifically address the importance of understanding the various processes that are involved in land management. For example, in South Australia we have a University of Adelaide subsidised unit, led by Dr Young, which deals with environmental matters. At Roseworthy Agricultural College, we have the Department of Natural Resources. The work of that department ensures a better understanding of the interaction between various management practices. We also have the Salisbury College of Advanced Education, which, more specifically, looks at the management of reserves and the provision of rangers. A number of other institutions, through their geography departments or through various technologies, play a vital part in this process. The South Australian Institute of Technology has developed the scanning of soil and plotting of information to a very advanced

level. The information produced by those scans, and its subsequent interpretation, has become a vital part of land management.

Incidentally, this activity is also bringing in quite a number of useful export dollars to South Australia. This technology is being used by developing countries in South-East Asia and also in parts of Africa, where experts from South Australia are providing contractual work on this scanning process. The Minister does not dodge the fact that there is a key new area in the powers contained in the Victorian legislation. He picked up that point by saying that the key new power that would be established is that of an interim conservation order (ICO). The report states:

It is designed to give immediate and comprehensive protection so that there is a breathing space during which a program for long-term protection can be worked out for a particular critical habitat. Those orders will be used only as a last resort where there is no other viable alternative available to protect the taxon or community. The Minister will make the last resort decision after consultation with the Chairperson of the Land Protection Council and the Conservation Advisory Committee.

In this State on recent occasions, the ministerial action we have seen has involved arriving on a doorstep to nail a piece of paper to a tree, preventing a person from the enjoyment of his own environment. The report refers to benefits inbuilt in this consultation process, which is essential, with recognised and respected organisations, in this case the Land Protection Council, which is to be determined under the powers of the particular Bill, and also the Conservation Advisory Committee, which will make information available to the Minister.

The Minister in the report again picks up the fact that they were moving away from some of the other relevant Acts (in particular, the Planning and Environment Act of 1987) by saying:

The powers to protect flora from taking, trading, keeping, moving or processing are broadened from those provided in the Wild Flowers and Native Plants Protection Act 1958. However, the very wide exemptions of private landholders, and those with the landholder's permission, from controls over taking where protected flora is not offered for the purposes of sale have been carried over. The handling of protected animals would continue under the Wildlife Act 1975.

So, we get this integration of effort I referred to previously. Finally, I draw attention to the Victorian Minister's statement that:

The Bill provides that:

(A) possession of protected flora is evidence, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, is proof of possession of protected flora in contravention of the legislation;

(B) a certificate of an authorised officer is evidence, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that a plant is a protected plant of the kind stated in the certificate; and

(C) in proceedings under this Act, a certificate of the Director-General indicating whether an interim conservation order was in force in respect of a particular area of land is evidence, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, is proof of the fact stated in the certificate.

The purpose of bringing that aspect of the legislation to the attention of the House is to indicate clearly that it was a piece of legislation with teeth, and any piece of legislation which seeks to provide for a worthwhile advance of flora and fauna requires teeth, but there is an inbuilt value which allows for the right of evidence to be led by the person so charged to prove his position. In some other legislation in the past, there is virtually no appeal or a very expensive appeal available to people.

Having indicated some aspects of the content of the Bill—and I will speak further on that a little later—I want to draw attention to the reaction to this legislation in the Legislative Council in Victoria where, on 21 April 1988, the Hon. M.T. Tehan, speaking on behalf of the combined Oppositions, said:

The Flora and Fauna Guarantee Bill has the potential to be a landmark in the preservation of our unique indigenous flora and fauna. I say 'potential' because the whole format of this Bill depends on its implementation and the resources and sensitivity that are brought to that implementation. The need for protection of our flora and fauna is well recognised.

I refer the House to a statement by the Victorian National Parks Association Inc., an organisation that has the support and considered regard of all Parties in this Parliament. The association states:

The whole issue of the extinction of flora and fauna is not a problem, it is a crisis. In this State we have some 500 threatened and endangered plants and 200 threatened and endangered vertebrate animals. Nationally about 10 per cent of 2 000 of our native flora is threatened.

Similarly, about 103, or 40 per cent of our 256 species of mammals are considered threatened, or extinct—86 and 17 respectively.

Those figures are not necessarily exact, because we may not yet realise all the species that are out there, even in our own State, and certainly in Australia. Certain areas in South Australia, and in Australia, have not yet had a proper evaluation by the people concerned and, therefore, the percentages may be out. However, we cannot get away from the fact that there is a large number of species which have already disappeared or which are already under threat of disappearing, and that is a fact which members of this Parliament, and other Parliaments, should heed and take positive action on. The quote from the Victorian National Parks Association Incorporated went one step further and put the whole thing into a global context, to which I adverted earlier, as follows:

We are part of a worldwide crisis, with the increasing rate of extinction of species over all the continents of the globe.

There is not a member here who would not accept that statement as fact. Indeed, it is an integral part of another debate listed in the House at present seeking to fortify action taken by the Commonwealth in respect of Antarctica. In fact, it seeks to strengthen the hand of the Commonwealth to ensure, among other things, the importance of protecting the fauna and flora in that habitat. I am pleased to have the member for Bright acknowledge, by nodding his head, the validity of what I am saying. The lead speaker for the Opposition in Victoria went on to refer to a publication *In the Nature of Australia* by Michael Morcombe, who took the argument further, saying that, in the event of species being threatened, endangered or lost in Victoria, the ramifications are faced throughout the world. In chapter 1, 'The Flora', he states:

The age-long isolation of this continent has given sufficient time for evaluation to proceed along many paths, with each plant becoming more and more changed compared with others which once were similar but which came to inhabit different environments. As a result, very few species have remained identical to plants of any other continent. An exceptional proportion of our plants are endemic, that is, they are found only in Australia. For this reason conservation of the flora is crucial; once a species becomes extinct in Australia it is simultaneously lost to the entire world.

The two words that I want to take up to emphasise the importance of the motion, and I believe capture the eventual attention of the House, appear in the last two quotations that I have just made. One word is 'crisis', and the other is 'crucial'. They truly highlight the importance and real endeavour which people in this State must acknowledge and undertake by considering this motion and acting quickly and positively on its passage.

A number of other quotations make equally interesting reading. I will not refer to them immediately, but so that members who want to follow this matter further can put it into its proper context I indicate that the Hon. Mr J.E. Kirner, the Minister responsible for introducing the legis-

lation into the Victorian Legislative Council, is reported at pages 921-4—

**Ms Gayler:** It's Mrs Kirner.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am sorry, and I am quite happy to accept that. It is not indicated in the record, although on a gender neutral basis Mr means Mrs and Mrs means Mr.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We have had no contention until now, and I would not want to be the one to start any. Mrs Kirner, in introducing the legislation, is recorded at pages 921-4 of the Council on 21 April 1988; and Mr M. T. Tehan—and hopefully I will not be gonged out on this one—

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** Mrs Marie Tehan.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Another Mrs; I am sorry. She is recorded in *Hansard* of 4 May 1988 at pages 1139-44; and other contributions follow. The total of those contributions and the consideration given in both Houses in Victoria led to the eventual passage of the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act of 1988, which was assented to on 24 May of that year. I am advised that the Victorian Government is so interested in this legislation and the bipartisan approach given to it that it immediately made available \$5 million in 1988 and allotted \$10 million to it in 1989. Victoria is concentrating effort where effort is necessary. I am not suggesting that the same amounts would be necessary in South Australia but, as I indicated earlier, it is a commitment of the Parliament—and the Government, in particular, by virtue of its holding the purse strings. In any event, assistance through a bipartisan approach and the allocation of considerable sums are necessary if we are to resolve this important issue effectively. I draw attention to section 67 of the Victorian legislation; under 'Availability for inspection', it provides:

The Director-General must make available for inspection at the principal offices of the department, at the Director-General's principal office and at regional departmental offices which the Director-General considers appropriate without charge during normal office hours—

- (a) the listing criteria; and
- (b) the Minister's decisions and reasons on nominations for listing; and
- (c) the list of protected flora and the wildlife protected under the Wildlife Act 1975; and
- (d) The Flora and Fauna Guarantee Strategy; and
- (e) any action statement; and
- (f) any management plan; and
- (g) any determination of critical habitat; and
- (h) a copy of any current interim conservation order; and
- (i) a copy of the department's latest annual report; and
- (j) a copy of the Act and the regulations; and
- (k) a copy of the second reading speeches made during the parliamentary debate of the Bill to provide for the conservation and management of flora and fauna.

That clause is unlike anything I have seen in nearly 20 years in the parliamentary scene, but it clearly shows the commitment of the Victorian Parliament to the purposes of this Act. Section 67 continues:

- (l) a copy of any public authority management agreement; and
- (m) the scientific advisory committee's final recommendation on nominations for listing and any comments to the Minister on that recommendation provided by the conservation advisory committee and the Land Protection Council.

I read that section because I believe it enhances the importance of the commitment that has been made by another legislature. It is a clear indication of the efforts that we will need to make in this State to fulfil the commitment that members from both sides of the House have given to the



public over some time. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### SEA AND WATERWAY POLLUTION

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I move:

That this House is of the opinion that any legislation presented to control pollution of seas and waterways by industry (broadly defined) necessitates that all State authorities and instrumentalities must comply equally as private or corporate organisations.

This motion puts into a precise form those statements which have been forthcoming from various Ministers of Environment and Planning over a period of time, and this will put into practice or require to be put into practice something that, even though it is spoken of in glowing terms at present, is not necessarily practised by the present Government, nor has it been practised by a number of other Governments of both political persuasions. I am not trying to take the mickey out of the present Government any more than to point out that it has been a fact of life that these actions, for the benefit of the State, have been put aside by a number of Governments of both political persuasions and it is time that we stood up to be counted. The Minister is not currently taking—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** He is not taking it lying down?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am glad the Minister is here to help me because, if he were to refer to the report of Estimates Committee B of Wednesday of last week, when the matter was discussed before the Minister of Environment and Planning, he would see that the clear indication was given that, notwithstanding that four Ministers of the Crown, including the Premier, have had drawn to their attention the vital issue of the placement of effluent from a business premises in one of the western suburbs. It was drawn to their attention because the effluent was being placed into the sewer, causing sewage to back up into the homes of people who were upstream from where the effluent was being placed and, subsequently, that effluent went into a small creek that runs into the western suburbs and eventually out to sea. It was placed under a bridge, where its movement could not be clearly seen by the community at large. That is being permitted to continue.

A large group of people living in that area have been adversely affected by the handling of that effluent from business premises, and those people have been knocking on the doors of the local member, directing questions to the appropriate Ministers and the Premier, and that continues to occur. That has been made known to the ministry, but it still continues and, unless some positive action has been taken since last Wednesday—and I am not aware that it has—it is still occurring today, with that material going into the creek, and eventually, out into the sea. If one goes on a train trip down the main north line from Gawler or Elizabeth to Adelaide, particularly in the southern Salisbury-Parafield area, one will see a drain running alongside the railway line and, if one happens to glance out the window, one will see a frothy, bubbling material flowing along that creek into the water system that goes out into the gulf, adjacent to the ICI works at Bolivar and alongside the Globe Derby track and subsequently out into the sea.

We are fully appreciative of the fact that there was, until last week, effluent going directly into the sea at Finger Point. Although Finger Point has been developed and is now operational, the number of organisations and businesses in the South-East that want to make use of that facility is being contained and a number of organisations still have to find a place to put their raw effluent or manufacturing effluent.

That does not auger well for the endeavours or drive of this Government to ensure that it will not be a polluter in its own way into the future. So that I can give the member for Albert Park an opportunity to move his motion, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I move:

That this House fully supports and endorses the Government's initiative in introducing the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and notes and applauds the decision to give additional support to this program as one of the many effective community programs aimed at reducing crime.

Many members in this place are well aware of my involvement in this arena. I congratulate the then Minister, the Hon. Gavin Keneally, who on 17 November when I asked the question in this place came up after Question Time and wanted more information from me in relation to how the system operates. History records that this scheme is now operating very successfully in South Australia. It is operating to the extent that at the last count about 164 Neighbourhood Watch schemes were working in this State. It involves many thousands of people in the community who, in conjunction with the local constabulary, have been prepared to provide their efforts and resources freely to combat crime in this State.

In moving around my electorate and beyond I am often asked what motivated me to raise this issue in State Parliament. As my colleague, the member for Bright says, it was my public spirit. Equally important was my recollection of the 1979 State election. I will not ever forget the disgusting campaign that Liberal Party members and their supporters waged attacking the then Premier, Des Corcoran, about law and order issues. That was the motivating force behind my desire to ensure that South Australia never again would be subjected to what I considered to be filthy and debased advertisements accusing the then Premier of being involved in or condoning rape. I recall particularly the masked bandit advertisement condoning those acts. It was outrageous, it was the pits and down into the slime as far I am concerned.

We on this side of the House are committed to the protection of the community in this State. Those law and order issues have not only been given the full force of support by this Government, the Police Force and many other agencies but also we have not stopped at those policies, but indeed we are continuing to confront crime in this State.

In the past day or so, members would have seen me counting out 'Together Against Crime' pamphlets.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** That is the cynicism of the honourable member opposite. If he had listened, and if he had the brain of even an ant, he would have realised that ever since I have been in this place I have raised this issue constantly and persistently. Indeed, I encourage all members of this place to distribute this pamphlet. I wonder whether the member for Heysen would be able to get off his butt and do a little bit himself. I very much doubt it. I very much doubt whether he would be prepared to put out these leaflets to show what this Government is doing and how concerned it is in these particular areas.

I say that because, once again, members opposite are peddling mistruths in the community. Only the other week the member for Light talked about law and order and tried to build up this perception in the community that we are under threat. The elderly people in this community, partic-

ularly in the eastern suburbs, are developing a fortress mentality. I know that my colleagues want to get on with their own motions, so I will curtail my remarks. I draw members' attention to the pamphlet put out by the State Government and, for the edification of members opposite, I indicate that it is 'freely available'.

**An honourable member:** Because we care.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Absolutely. They are freely available. On the back of that pamphlet it states:

For details on grant applications contact: Crime Prevention Unit, Attorney-General's Department.

A telephone number is given. I want all members of Parliament to become involved in this area and to pick up the pamphlet 'Together Against Crime', which is a policy plan for the South Australian crime prevention strategy.

I was tickled pink when I went home and picked up the local *Southern Times*, as is my wont (and I suggest that every member in this place should read that newspaper), and read a letter headed, 'Well done Kevin', as follows:

I write to express my appreciation and add to the congratulations for Albert Park MP Kevin Hamilton. Mr Hamilton celebrated 10 years in Parliament on Friday, 15 September.

As many would no doubt recall, the 1979 election was a difficult one for Kevin who came in among turbulent times.

Obviously, this young lad is very perceptive. It continues:

Since then, Kevin has continued to divert all his attention to the needs of his electorate, some of which has gone into being the first to introduce Neighbourhood Watch into South Australia, the concern for the environment when it was not so fashionable, and his continuing support for the QEH with his Port Pirie walk.

People would also be aware of his work in order to build up a community spirit, thereby enabling people to resolve their problems among themselves.

Certainly there are few politicians who service their electorates as thoroughly as Kevin does, and therefore he deserves all the accolades.

JOE CAPELLA, Seaton

I invite anyone in this House who says that I encouraged this lad to write that letter to come and see me after, and I will give them his details and they can ring him themselves. I thank the writer of that letter very much for that. I appreciate his accolades. He is well known to me, I do not walk away from that. I am proud to know the lad. I am well aware that he knows me, but the article was done on his own initiative. His recognition of my involvement in the Neighbourhood Watch scheme is quite clear. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### WEST LAKES DUNES

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I move:

That this House congratulate the Government for its decision to end the encroachment on beach front land at West Lakes and Tennyson and thereby to protect our environmentally sensitive dune areas.

My involvement in this matter goes back to a time prior to 1979 when I entered Parliament. A group called SOS (Save our Sand-dunes) was formed in the area. I still believe that the sand-dunes should not have been built on. However, decisions were made and houses were built on this very environmentally sensitive area. I make no reflection on those people who built the houses there, but it was a very regrettable decision. When I came into this job I was very much aware of the environmental issues pertaining to my electorate. My concerns are recorded in *Hansard*. The first matter I raised concerned the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. There are many others too numerous to list in this debate.

As members would know I like walking, and over the years I have regularly walked along the beach down my way from Trimmer Parade to Fort Glanville and return. I have noticed the activities in the dunal area in relation to properties abutting the Coastal Protection Board land. On further inspection I found that people were encroaching on the dunal area. A number of people had extended their properties from their legal boundary out into the sand-dunes. They not only flattened the sand-dunes but also put in sprinkler systems and sowed lawn. One chap extended his property quite a considerable way into the dunal area and set up a rockery and swing, etc. I would conservatively estimate that area of land to be worth \$20 000 to \$25 000—not a bad investment.

Due to time constraints in this debate, I simply want to put on record the manner in which the Government has addressed this issue. It has taken some time but, as I indicated to the Minister for Environment and Planning, there were people in my area, and indeed within the local sub-branch of my Party, who were prepared to go to the wall on this issue, because they felt so strongly about the matter. Shortly after being elected, the new Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. Susan Lenehan), member for Mawson, came down and looked at the situation and agreed wholeheartedly with what we were advocating, and took a recommendation to Cabinet. A decision was made, and those people now have to withdraw from their encroachment, and those sand-dunes will have to be returned to their former condition by April next year. I applaud the decision made by the Minister and Cabinet. To do otherwise would have meant a cancerous blight on the reputation of this Government. In no way did I want to see that and it would have opened up a Pandora's box had the Government condoned such activities. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 17 August. Page 386.)

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I oppose the Bill. It seeks to amend the Holidays Act to provide that the Australia Day holiday will always be taken on 26 January. When 26 January falls on a Sunday, the Bill provides that the holiday be taken on the following Monday, as is the case with the Anzac Day holiday. The member for Elizabeth, in his capacity as Chairman of the Elizabeth Australia Day Committee, says that, unless the holiday is taken on the actual day, the significance and the meaning of our national day is often lost. I do not agree with the honourable member's reasoning. As we see every year, people in our community who wish to celebrate their religious beliefs are certainly not adversely affected by Easter being observed on different days each year. Celebrations, church services and general observance of this historic event continues regardless. If the significance of Easter is undiminished by being observed on other days, why should the significance of Australia Day be diminished by not being observed on the same day? The important thing is that a day is set aside for this very important event, as is the case with other events, such as Easter.

Section 3 of the Holidays Act provides that, when a day falls on a day other than a Monday, the following Monday shall be observed as a holiday. In response to various requests the Industrial Relations Advisory Council has reviewed the situation several times over recent years and each time has

concluded that the cost to industry of a one day mid-week close-down, and the community reaction to the loss of the normal January long weekend, would not be in the State's best interest. Thus it maintains its existing policy, that is, that there should be no change in the existing arrangements whereby the Australia Day holiday is taken as a long weekend.

A long weekend at this time of the year gives excellent opportunity for organisations to arrange events, in particular sporting events; because of the three-day break, people can travel long distances to participate in these events. At sporting events and other events I have attended over the years, in almost all cases, especially on the Monday, there is some sort of celebration in recognition of Australia Day.

When advising the council of the decision that the Australia Day celebrations in 1989 and subsequent years would be held on a Monday, the Minister of Labour advised that a change would not be further considered until support was forthcoming from unions, industry leaders and the community at large. When such support is forthcoming, the situation will be reviewed again. At this stage, I oppose the Bill and I urge all members to do likewise.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I am very disappointed to learn that the Government does not intend to support this legislation. I believe that, if Australia Day is to have its real meaning as our day of national celebration, it is essential that it be held on that day each year. It is not a date that we can alter for the convenience of the trade union movement or isolated sections of the community. This is something in which the whole community must participate and that was demonstrated during the bicentennial year, and the good work our nation has built on in that year must continue in the future.

The only way to secure that is to ensure that the holiday is on the correct day each year. The honourable member who spoke on behalf of the Government raised the issue of religious holidays. I challenge the Government to alter the day on which Christmas Day is held. Under this Government, will we have Christmas Day on the nearest convenient Monday: is that the proposal? I really do not think that this House, this community or even this Government would seriously suggest such a thing. I believe that, just as Christmas Day has a special significance of itself, so does Australia Day. I do not mean that it has the same level of emotional or religious significance, but Australia Day is a specific day, as is Christmas Day. The honourable member's illusion in that respect is not one I would choose to share.

**Mr Peterson:** What about Mr Hawke's comments?

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** As my colleague, the member for Semaphore points out, even the Prime Minister of our country, in his capacity as national leader of the Government Party, strongly supports this move. I advised the Prime Minister of my intention to introduce this Bill and was very pleased to receive a written letter of support from him. It is unfortunate that he does not have more influence on the—

**Mr Peterson:** It's a pity he doesn't have a vote here.

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** If he had a vote here, I am sure that we would have his support and I believe that, ultimately, members of the Government in this place will support their Federal Leader and will see the light of my proposal. The question of community support was amply demonstrated in the short time in which it was possible to raise signatures on the petition. Yesterday this House received a petition from about 14 000 South Australian residents showing their support for this legislation. Whenever I have addressed this matter in the community, it has received full support. I

know that isolated groups would not be pleased by the change, but change is never easy and this House must resolve this problem, if not today, then certainly in the future. I commend the Bill to the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, M.J. Evans (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Ingerson, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Peterson and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Crafter, De Laine (teller), Duigan and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

## ANTARCTICA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House strongly supports the principle of Antarctica becoming a World Heritage Wilderness Park and opposes the notion that Australia should become a signatory to the Antarctic Mining Convention; and further, this House supports the Federal Government proposal to negotiate a comprehensive environmental convention for Antarctica.

(Continued from 24 August. Page 615.)

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I will not have time to say everything I want to say today, and the opportunity will be provided for me to speak later. I give notice that I intend to amend the motion by adding the words 'under the auspices of the Antarctic treaty' so that it would read:

That this House strongly supports the principle of Antarctica becoming a World Heritage Wilderness Park under the auspices of the Antarctic treaty and opposes the notion that Australia should become a signatory to the Antarctic Mining Convention; and further, this House supports the Federal Government proposal to negotiate a comprehensive environmental convention for Antarctica.

When the opportunity is provided, I will indicate the most important role that has been adopted in this debate by the Liberal and National Parties in the Commonwealth Parliament. On 2 May 1989, the Liberal and National Parties announced their decision to oppose Australia's signature of the proposed convention on the regulation of Antarctic mineral resources. This convention had, to that date, been enthusiastically supported by the Labor Federal Minister for the Environment and the Labor Foreign Minister.

Following the decision of the coalition Parties, under pressure from vast numbers of the Australian community, the Labor Government, some weeks later, announced its own belated opposition to the signing of the convention. By leading the debate in Australia, the coalition Parties at the Federal level have played a role of world leadership. The minerals convention would, in the opinion of the Liberal Party, have threatened the environment of the Antarctic. Australia's decision not to sign means that the convention will not come into effect. That decision not to sign would not have been made unless the coalition Parties at the Federal level took the stand they did and, from Opposition, they have played a critical role in the saving of the environment of the Antarctic continent.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

## PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of State Development and Technology  
(Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Marineland—Summary of Receiver's and Manager's  
Payment Schedules.

## QUESTION TIME

## MARINELAND

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology agree, immediately after Question Time, to listen to certain tapes that I have in my possession so that the Government can satisfy itself that a senior officer of the Department of State Development and Technology and the Zhen Yun Company did say it was the Government's decision that the Marineland redevelopment should not proceed?

Yesterday, the Government tried to dismiss discussions involving Zhen Yun, the Tribond company and a senior officer of the Department of State development and technology as 'hearsay'. This morning, Government minders have been alleging that these discussions were fabricated. But I have in my possession the relevant tapes. They record Mr Lee advising Tribond that the Government had decided that the project should not proceed because of union bans and opposition from Greenpeace, and statements by a senior officer of the Department of State Development and Technology, Mr Oh, that the future of the project depended on decisions to be made by the Premier and the Minister, and not Zhen Yun. I invite the Minister to listen to these tapes after Question Time this afternoon so that he can reconsider his position in this matter.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is interesting to note the line that has been taken by the Leader. I have offered him a full briefing on the Marineland affair—I have said, 'Come after Question Time and have a full briefing'—and this is the Leader who has constantly refused to accept that invitation. Now he is inviting me to a private briefing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair does not wish to have a repetition of the disorderly behaviour of members yesterday. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The Leader of the Opposition is now inviting me to take part in a private briefing. What has he got to hide? The facts are that he has these tapes within his access. I might say that I smell a rat here. He is trying to get me implicated in something which may well be an offence under the Telecommunications Act. I have not had legal advice on whether or not this is the case. I would need to seek the advice of my colleague the Attorney-General before I became a willing party to listening to those particular tapes.

The facts are that I am not advised, because we have not been told, of the extent to which all the other parties to these alleged conversations that have been transcribed were willing to have their conversations taped, if that was the case. The other point on which I am not advised, because the Leader has not made it clear, is whether or not the transcripts that allegedly record these conversations are complete recordings of all the conversations that took place with no editing and no other variation to what is in those matters.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the second time. The first time I may not

have specifically mentioned him, but it was clearly aimed at him. He is being called to order for a second time.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, there was general hubbub in the House when the Speaker last called the House to order. There was general hubbub with both sides interjecting. To say that your remarks, Sir, were directed at the Leader seems quite irrelevant, with respect.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Not half, there's not!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the Deputy Leader wants to get himself into similar difficulties as on previous occasions, he is going the right way about it. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I suggest that what the Leader should be doing is making this information available by tabling it in the House, rather than by calling upon me, somehow trying to beguile me into something which, in the absence of advice, may well see me implicated in a breach of the Telecommunications Act. I want to refer to a couple of statements reported to the House yesterday by members of the Opposition with respect to one officer of the Department of State Development and Technology. I have spoken to that officer about those two statements. One appears on page 6 of the *Hansard* proof and one on page 13.

In both cases, the officer advises that never did he give permission for the taping of a conversation. He was never asked whether he would give permission for that and he had no knowledge that he was being taped. To the extent that he can recall the comments that are now attributed to him, with respect to the comment about Mr Virgo, there was nothing exceptional about that comment. All that says, as has been acknowledged by the Premier in this place and by the Minister of Local Government in another place, is that Mr Virgo is a very able, shrewd and straight negotiator. With respect to the other statement attributed to the officer of the department, the alleged statement quoted in *Hansard* reads:

The Premier wanted to work through what has been discussed and . . . once he has made up his view then the Minister would be in a position to talk about the project with Zhen Yun.

That statement does not actually say anything at all, except that there would have to be discussions within Government about the project. So what? What about the project? What various issues may that have referred to? What it does not say and what the Leader wants us to believe it says is that the Government was pressuring, blackmailing or cajoling Zhen Yun into withdrawing from the project which, of course, as was adequately pointed out, was not the case and never has been the case. So, the Opposition is attempting some disgraceful tactics involving the use of tapes of alleged conversations, which I think is a very disreputable way to go about business, especially when people do not have the honesty to say to the other party that their conversation is going to be taped. What is there to hide? If someone wants to tape a conversation, why does he not say to the other party—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order and I specifically call to order the member for Heysen, the member for Victoria, the member for Coles, the Deputy Leader and the Leader of the Opposition. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Why would the person doing the taping not have the courage, the honesty and the guts to say to the other party, 'By the way, I may have some interests that I need to protect in this matter. It will be therefore important for me that there is an accurate transcript of this conversation. Do you mind if I tape it?' But with respect to at least one of the people allegedly taped in this matter, that person says that no such point of view or

question was put to him by the person alleged to have taped the conversation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Adelaide to order.

*Mr Duigan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has no intention of tolerating boorish behaviour from any member of the House. The honourable member for Fisher.

### HOMESTART

**Mr TYLER (Fisher):** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House what role HomeStart loans can play in addressing the question of housing affordability in South Australia? Figures from the Real Estate Institute of Australia published in today's media suggest that the South Australian home loan affordability ratio as measured by the institute is now 32 per cent. This compares with an Australia-wide average of 35.8 per cent of weekly income spent on housing.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Fisher for his question. I saw the article in this morning's *Advertiser* and again in this afternoon's *News*. Whilst the figure for South Australia is unacceptably high, it is encouraging to see that it is still around 32 per cent of household income that is being spent on housing. To those members opposite—

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:**—who are perhaps getting some enjoyment out of the fact—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I again call the member for Mitcham to order.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:**—that South Australians are paying 32.4 per cent of their household income on housing, I suggest that they look at what people are paying under the Liberal Government in New South Wales where the people the Liberal Party is governing are in real trouble. There is no mechanism in New South Wales to allow people to receive any form of help. We have made perfectly clear to people finding it hard to meet their mortgage payments that, apart from our successful mortgage relief scheme and our interest rate protection plan, under HomeStart there is the ability for people to refinance their loans.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I am pleased to advise the House that many thousands of people are ringing the HomeStart hotline seeking assistance and advice with a view to refinancing. The advantage for those people who wish to refinance is that their repayments will be pegged at 25 per cent of their income. My advice to people finding it difficult under existing conventional loans who wish to refinance is to use the HomeStart hotline and seek information, and it will be pointed out that the Government and HomeStart are sympathetic to those people. Indeed, I urge all members opposite to abandon their Leader and the member for Bragg in their opposition to HomeStart, and to encourage their constituents who are having problems to contact the HomeStart hotline for official help over this unfortunate period.

### MARINELAND

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** In view of the Minister of State Development and Technology's continuing claims that

Zhen Yun and not the Government made the decision to scrap the Marineland redevelopment, will the Minister explain why, at a meeting on 8 February this year, with parties involved in the project, the Director for State Development and Technology, Mr Hartley, advised those parties that the decision to scrap the project had been taken by Cabinet? I refer to a meeting that took place at 5.30 p.m. on 8 February this year in the office of the Director for State Development and Technology.

**Mr HAMILTON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. By way of interjection, I heard a statement that this question is on notice. Will you, Mr Speaker, check to see whether that is a fact?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair cannot give a ruling on a second-hand version of an interjection. The honourable member for Victoria.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** At the meeting to which I have referred, at which Mr Hartley was present with the Deputy Director, Ms Eccles, I am advised that Mr Hartley told representatives of the Tribond company that the department had put a submission to Cabinet supporting a go-ahead for the Marineland redevelopment. This is consistent with statements that Mr Oh, of the department, had made in the previous week to the Tribond company as revealed in the discussions, of which the Opposition has records. Mr Oh had told Mr Rod Abel of Tribond on 1 February that he believed the project would proceed.

Returning to the meeting on 8 February, I am advised that Mr Hartley said that when the departmental submission had been returned without Cabinet's approval, the department had been surprised. Mr Hartley then told the representatives of Tribond that his advice from Cabinet was that the development could not proceed because of the union bans and the opposition of Greenpeace.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is interesting to note that the report of this particular meeting by the honourable member relies on information given by people who are obviously not averse to taping, without telling others what they are doing, and various other types of activities that I think are highly questionable. We are now asked to believe that such people's reporting of a meeting is in fact correct. Everything the Director for State Development and Technology has said in this matter over the months—

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I do not deny the meeting took place; I do not know, because I do not have his diary with me. I am denying that he would have made that particular statement. The Director for State Development and Technology, who has made statements on this matter for many months, as well as in an article in the *Advertiser* and again this morning, I think indicates exactly how he sees the situation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—and that endorses the comments I have been making. We are now being asked to accept that someone present at that meeting (if that meeting took place), who was also apparently quite willing to tape other people's conversations without having the honesty to say that that activity was being undertaken, is now reporting other activities that are alleged to have taken place; and I am expected to say, 'Goodness me, all the other information we have given this place is incorrect.' The facts that I identified yesterday that were sent by the Department of State Development and Technology to Lawrence Lee confirming the nature of the telephone conversation between him and me on 2 February are facts that were never rebutted

by Lawrence Lee, because he tells the truth, and we are expected to say that this substance of evidence is to be thrown aside by rumour, report—

**Mrs Appleby:** Innuendo.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:**—and innuendo by people whose motives I think we must substantially doubt, to try to discredit the Director for State Development and Technology. That is part of the shameful exercise that this Opposition has been working at for many months now. The Leader of the Opposition takes exception to that. I ask him to look at his own actions over recent months to try to shaft that person and damage his credibility for shameful political motives.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

### HOMESTART LOANS

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction inform the House of the latest level of community response to the Government's new HomeStart loan scheme? Many of my constituents have informed me that they have contacted the HomeStart hotline in an endeavour to receive information on the scheme. However, a number of my constituents have expressed surprise that they cannot get through to the hotline because it is engaged. Will the Minister respond?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has not yet called the honourable Minister. The Chair is waiting for the House to come to order before doing so. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your assistance, but I am used to that sort of behaviour from members opposite. I thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to advise the House that the Bannon Government's new HomeStart loan scheme continues to be an overwhelming hit with ordinary South Australians—and by 'ordinary South Australians' I do not mean the Porsche set who live in Toorak Gardens or Burnside. Since it opened on 5 September the HomeStart hotline has received 8 500 inquiries, and more than 3 100 people have registered with HomeStart Finance to be considered for a loan.

The response to HomeStart loans has far surpassed the expectations of this Government, and the sheer volume of inquiries is causing some delays in processing loan registrations. I am asking the people of South Australia to be patient, both in making contact and in relation to receiving printed information. We will soon be notifying the first group who have been registered for a loan of their acceptance and inviting them to contact one of the three HomeStart loan retailers. The retailers are the Hindmarsh Adelaide Building Society, the Co-op Building Society and the State Bank. May I remind members that the HomeStart hotline is 008 018788.

### PRISON OFFICERS

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** My question is directed to the Minister of Correctional Services. What policy does the Government have in relation to prison officers fraternising with prisoners in South Australian gaols, and has this policy changed since the department was given a complaint last year of at least one prison officer beginning an affair with a prisoner? The Opposition has been advised that the

department was informed last year of a case in which a prison officer at Northfield left his wife as the result of a sexual relationship begun in gaol with a prisoner. We have been informed this sexual relationship was common knowledge in Northfield at the time, and that other prison officers told the prison officer's wife such relationships were 'Not unusual, that they didn't like it but there wasn't much they could do about it.'

The prison officer concerned is now living with this inmate who has been released from Northfield on to the home detention scheme. He is now divorced as a result of this liaison and his ex-wife has reported to us that the department's reaction to her complaint led her to understand that nothing was done to stop the sexual relationship in gaol or to discipline the officer for any wrongdoing.

We now have information of at least three similar cases of sexual relationships between officers and inmates in one gaol. We can provide the Minister with these names on a confidential basis so that he can further investigate the matter. The information we have suggests that, contrary to Government statements that prisoners are not allowed conjugal rights, these activities are taking place within our prisons provided the other party is a prison officer.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I think that that is a quite outrageous slur on prison officers. The member for Mitcham's last sentence was absolutely despicable: that there is a Government policy or a *de facto* arrangement that conjugal rights are acceptable in our prisons provided one of the parties is a prison officer. That is an outrageous statement to make against all prison officers in this State, who do a very difficult job for this community, and they deserve better than the member for Mitcham smearing them in that way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Allegations of this type are made from time to time and they are investigated by the Department of Correctional Services. If there is any suggestion or sufficient evidence of such an occurrence, then, of course, the prison officer would be disciplined, and disciplined very severely indeed.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I think the honourable member has done enough damage to prison officers; he should just pipe down while I answer the question.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** We're talking about three prison officers.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, the Deputy Leader says the member for Mitcham was talking about three prison officers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I suggest that the Deputy Leader have a look at *Hansard* tomorrow—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:**—to see what the member for Mitcham said: and he will find out that is not what he said. He outrageously smeared them. But I am happy to look at the examples that the member for Mitcham purports to have. I will have them investigated and I will have the results of those investigations reported back to the House, because there is no question that such behaviour would not be tolerated.

However, there is another aspect to this, and that is the question of relationships between prison officers and ex-prisoners. I point out that ex-prisoners, by definition, are no longer under the control of the Department of Correc-

tional Services: they are ex-prisoners. What prison officers do in their private life, whether it is with ex-prisoners or anyone else, is their business. The State has no role—none whatsoever—in either investigating any of those arrangements or doing anything about them. If we attempted to do that, there would, quite properly in my view, be an outcry from a number of parties and organisations in this State. And I would support that outcry, as it is none of our business. Whilst we may have a private view on the matter, it is still none of our official business. If the member for Mitcham supplies me with those names, I will certainly have them looked at and a report brought back to the Parliament. I would like the member for Mitcham to look at what he actually said and apologise to prison officers in general for smearing them in that way.

#### LEGALITY OF TAPE RECORDINGS

**Mr DUIGAN: (Adelaide):** My question is directed to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister investigate whether the statements, allegations and information contained on the tapes that the Leader of the Opposition has in his possession might have been obtained and used illegally? The Leader of the Opposition, earlier in Question Time, referred to tapes that he had in his possession and, in response to an interjection, said that he did not have to get the permission of those people who were being taped. Section 4 of the Listening Devices Act 1972-1974 provides:

Except as is provided in this Act a person shall not intentionally use any listening device to overhear, record, monitor or listen to any private conversation, whether or not he is a party thereto, without the consent, express or implied, of the parties to that conversation.

Penalty: Two thousand dollars or imprisonment for six months or both.

Section 5 of the Act provides:

A person shall not knowingly communicate or publish any information or material derived from the use of a listening device in contravention of section 4 of this Act.

Penalty: Two thousand dollars or imprisonment for six months or both.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I again call the Leader to order.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** I thank the honourable member for raising this important issue. It is a matter of moment and of public importance. I will most certainly ask the Attorney-General to investigate this matter. It is in the interests of the proper administration of justice and, indeed, the conduct and ethics of this Parliament that this matter be properly interpreted and advice be given to the Parliament. Obviously, the Opposition is claiming that it has sought legal advice, and the member for Adelaide has read out the relevant sections of the Listening Devices Act—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** The Opposition may seek to avoid the spirit of this legislation, which is very clear. The intention of this Parliament is expressed in that legislation but now, for its own purposes, obviously the Opposition intends to provide its own interpretation of the legislation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFT:** The Opposition is very sensitive about this matter, and I will have the Attorney-General examine it and give advice on the interpretation that the Opposition is alleging on this matter, which I would suggest is of considerable public importance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition does not have some protected status that allows him to continue to interject when the House has been called to order. I again call the Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable Deputy Leader.

#### MARINO ROCKS MARINA

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Minister for Environment and Planning have any idea who exactly will now be the developer of the proposed \$360 million marina development at Marino Rocks; has she been made aware of the change of circumstances of Mintern; does she know who is now the owner of Mintern Pty Ltd; and has she a commitment that the development is still going ahead?

For almost a year it was a Melbourne-based company called Crestwin which was negotiating with the Government to develop Marino Rocks. The owner of Crestwin was a Mr Bill Turner. Last Wednesday, when the Minister announced the go ahead for the development, the company involved changed to Mintern, a company we were told was an Adelaide-based company especially established for the project. A company search has shown that Mintern had, as directors, Mr Bill Turner, the owner of Crestwin, Mr Bill Howell, the Chief Executive of Crestwin, and Mr Anthony Vaughan, the Property Manager of Crestwin.

Mintern operates from the Crestwin offices at the marina site and Crestwin Property Manager, Anthony Vaughan, is on record as stating that he will be handling the development arrangements in cooperation with councils and residents, including a public forum to take place in the next week. Today we are informed that Mintern has been sold to a Melbourne-based company called Burlock, and that Mr Turner is no longer involved with Mintern or the project.

These details raise questions about who now looks after the project when the hands on manager was actually a Crestwin employee since Crestwin has now divested itself of Mintern, where Mintern offices are now, if no longer part of Crestwin, and whether the new owners of Mintern have given any commitment at all to the Minister that they are interested in continuing with the Marino Rocks project.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I think that I can simplify the whole matter by reading to the House a letter which Mr Bruce Guerin, Director of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, received from Tony Vaughan, described as Project Director, Marino Rocks project. The letter is dated 27 September and it is by facsimile delivery. It is couched in such terms that the proponent of the letter could use it as a press release. The letter says:

Mr W. Turner, the major shareholder of Marino Rocks proponent Mintern Pty Ltd announced today that he had sold his interests in the project to national developer Mr Alan Burlock, of the Burlock group of companies. Mr Turner has done this with much regret, but does not wish current difficulties with his other business interests to place any pressure on development at Marino Rocks. Mr Tony Vaughan, who has been largely responsible for putting the project together, will be remaining with the development as Project Director and as Director of Mintern.

As Mintern's intention was to gain the services of a joint-venture partner, it is extremely pleasing to have a group such as Burlock involved; the successful record of this group and its associated companies will virtually ensure the completion of this project of national significance, Mr Vaughan said. The Burlock group is a Melbourne-based national development company.

Mintern Pty Ltd which will continue as the proponent company, will soon be opening a project office in Adelaide. Initially to be used as a base from which information on the development can be obtained, the office will be located at 45 Flinders Street, Adelaide in conjunction with the project's engineers (Maunsell and Partners). Mintern is currently preparing detailed information on the project:

(1) A major display of the project will be made available to the City of Marion;

(2) An information package will be available from the project office.

Both of the above will be available as soon as the above facilities are operational.

As I understand it, conversations were held with Government officers yesterday when it was made perfectly clear that the Burlock group intends to continue with the project. Crestwin is not in receivership at present, and this was checked as of this morning. Braemar is in receivership and Crestwin, of course, holds shares in Braemar.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** There is the letter: there is the intention of the company which currently owns both the land and the project.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Premier cannot display documents.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Sorry, Sir. I merely make the point that I have read a letter which makes quite clear the intention of the company which now owns the land and the project. It is not for members opposite to believe me: it is for members opposite to tell me whether or not they believe that the company from whom I have quoted is telling the truth.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Briggs.

#### ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House when work will begin on the construction of the world-class entertainment centre at Hindmarsh which has been so vigorously opposed by the State Opposition?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has not yet called on the Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, there is a motion before the House on the very subject of the question raised, and it is in the name of the Minister, who has the adjournment. It is under Orders of the Day: Other Business, No. 19. It is the motion I introduced in this House a couple of weeks ago and, quite unusually (and something unprecedented in this House), the Minister took the adjournment to stall the debate. It is in his name.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's remarks are not part of his point of order, which the Chair does not uphold anyway.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** That attempt by the member for Alexandra just highlights what the member for Briggs said; that the Opposition is still bitterly opposed to the entertainment centre. It is rather interesting that, even though the report has been received by this House and the addendum which members of the Opposition clearly wanted to have inserted has been inserted, they still do not understand that the entertainment centre will go ahead. I will be only too pleased to tell the House exactly when and what it is all about.

I thank the member for Briggs for his enthusiasm to play his part in making sure that a world-class entertainment centre will take place and will be available for the young people of South Australia. The House will be very interested to know that a tender has been selected for the construction

of the entertainment centre, and I understand that the Premier will be making an announcement some time today as to the identity of the successful tenderer.

With the conclusion of that part of the process, work is scheduled to begin on site next month. I would like to think that now this is happening the Opposition will join all South Australians in looking forward with great anticipation to the commencement of building work on this exciting project, and I assure the member for Alexandra that, when the entertainment centre is opened with world-class acts, he will get an invitation buckshee.

#### MARINELAND

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** My question is to the Minister of State Development and Technology. In view of an article in this morning's *Advertiser* by the Director for State Development and Technology, Mr Rod Hartley, and his interview on the ABC with Keith Conlon, will the Minister now give approval for other parties involved in the Marineland redevelopment to be able to speak freely to the media?

I am aware that a number of people with knowledge of this situation have asked the Minister for permission to be released from a deed of confidentiality so they can speak to the media. In particular, the Department of State Development and Technology has received correspondence from legal representatives for the Abel family. In a letter dated 3 August the department was advised that the Abels sought the Minister's consent 'to make such responses to the media as they may consider necessary and appropriate.' In a further letter to the department, dated 24 August, legal representatives for the Abels stated 'the fact is that our clients have been unfairly "muzzled on all Marineland issues".'

The Abels' legal representatives had been advised that they would receive a reply from the Minister a week ago. This was extended to yesterday. But that reply has still to be received, ensuring that while the Minister uses a public servant to defend the Government's political position—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's comments are out of order.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order for the last time today. Any further disruptive behaviour on his part and he will be named. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I will take first the last point made by the honourable member in her comment. She implied that I had said that we would respond by 20 September and then by 27 September. I might say that I have never given that advice to anyone. What happened in the first letter received from the solicitors for the Abels was that in their letter they said 'reply by 20 September'. They said it, not me. I will not have my diary, my time, organised by others in a peremptory way. I have now written to the solicitors and I will read that letter into *Hansard*, as follows:

I refer to your letter of 15 September—

and this is to the solicitors on behalf of Grant and Margarete Abel—

**The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore:** Of what date?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is today's date. It continues:

I am advised that my consent to your clients responding to the statement which I made on the *7.30 Report* which referred to the inability of the Tribond Corporation to fulfil its commitment in mounting a viable financial proposal for the creation of a marine-land at the relevant site is not required. This statement refers to the period of time where Tribond was itself attempting to put



together a viable development, the period of time before the Government became concerned and sought alternatives and before the Zhen Yun group first became involved.

On the advice that I have received from the Crown Solicitor, your clients will not be in breach of the confidentiality requirements of the agreement entered into if they confine themselves to a response to the statement in that context.

*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** It is interesting to note the issue involved here. I have not released that heads of agreement to the public, in this House or anywhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I again call the member for Mitcham to order. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I have honoured my part of that agreement. I have not released that information, because I have been bound by the clauses in that with respect to the issues relevant to the heads of agreement. That is important. The honourable member is now saying that these people have been unfairly muzzled on all Marineland issues, which is not the case. The confidentiality clause refers to those issues specifically pertinent to the agreement itself.

The other point that I made previously—it seems that one has to make these points to the Opposition many times; indeed, one would even be guilty of droning on in making those points repeatedly—is that, now that the Leader has chosen to make the heads of agreement public, people can read what is in there. It will be seen that the confidentiality clause of that agreement refers to a limited area indeed. There is another matter which I also identified yesterday, in terms of the letter written by the Deputy Director for State Development and Technology to the solicitors, which of course identified that the Tribond Corporation is involved in legal action against Zhen Yun Corporation.

The principals of Tribond Corporation have initiated that. The advice that I received from Crown Law in June was that there were a number of matters in this other case which limited my capacity to comment on a number of issues, because of the Crown's position. As the letter of the Deputy Director of the Department of State Development and Technology says, one side is asking for an unimpeded unilateral right to comment while, on the other side, I, as Minister, have constraints on me due to that other separate legal action to which I am not a party.

The point I have made is that I have honoured that part of the confidentiality clause of the agreement that refers to a very limited area of activity. It seems to me that the Abels have found themselves quite able to comment on many areas of this whole debate; they seem to be doing so very freely. I repeat: I at least have honoured my part of that agreement to which I am a signatory.

#### WESTCLIFF MARINA

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give the public of South Australia an assurance that public participation will be sought during the preparation of a supplementary development plan on the proposed marina at Westcliff? Further, will the Minister give a similar assurance that a statement of environmental factors prepared under section 63 will be made available to interested members of the public?

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** In short, the answer to both those questions is 'Yes'. I will first address the question relating to the supplementary development plan to explain the situation for the benefit of the honourable member, his constituents and for other interested members. The whole question relates to a two stage process of public information

and public consultation. The first is the preparation of a supplementary development plan; this is currently being prepared and will include a statement of investigations that will address issues relating to the use of land for the proposed purposes.

The SDP will be on public exhibition for eight weeks, and this will be followed by a public hearing and a review by the council (which is, of course, the Marion council) and the Advisory Committee on Planning. The issues that will be addressed in a policy sense in a supplementary development plan include: the suitability of the site in relation to coastal processes (and that, of course, relates to the marina site suitability study); Aboriginal heritage; geological significance; non-Aboriginal heritage; marine impacts; access to the site and foreshore; use of Hills face zone land; and infrastructure requirements.

In respect of the second part of the question, documentation is also being prepared as part of the section 63 scheme, and this will cover a range of issues of a more technical nature—namely, breakwater design, which, of course, includes adequacy of design, maintenance requirements and navigational safety; the construction impact such as dredging, blasting and transportation of breakwater material; management and maintenance; detailed access and infrastructure provision; traffic and parking; landscaping and visual impact; detailed heritage implications; litigation measures; and implications for noise, air quality, erosion, hydrology, flora and fauna. While, under the requirements of section 63, I do not have to release publicly the statement of environmental factors, I give the honourable member and this House a commitment that it is my intention, and has been from the very beginning—from when the Premier and I released this project—to do so fully and in an open way.

#### MARINELAND

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I direct my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. If, as the Government now claims through the statements of the Director of the Department of State Development and Technology in the *Advertiser* this morning, Zhen Yun withdrew from the Marineland redevelopment because of community opposition, did the Government tell Zhen Yun that it would be prepared to confront that opposition, particularly the union bans, so that the project could proceed and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I have made the point previously that Zhen Yun withdrew because the commercial viability of the marineland component of the project did not stand up. It did that based on an economic assessment, and that economic assessment included its understanding of community opposition in South Australia to the keeping of cetacea in captivity, and that that would be likely to affect the long-term commercial returns of such a project. That really was the nub of the issue because, if patronage figures would not hold up in the long-term because of growing community disquiet about such things, people would simply not be coming in the numbers needed to make the project viable—and that, we understand, was the key reason which affected its decision that that was not a commercially viable proposition to include in the development.

Of course, they have come back with a development that includes a hotel and conference centre. So, it is their belief that the long-term patronage figures would not have been sustained, due to growing community concern about the keeping of cetacea in captivity.

### MASTERS GAMES

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say how many athletes have registered for the Masters Games to be held in Adelaide next month? Is he satisfied with the number of interstate and overseas competitors? Have any arrangements been made to welcome the interstate and overseas competitors to Adelaide?

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the member for Adelaide for his question. His electorate, of course, will play an important part in the games, because many of the sports will be held within that area. For instance, the swimming events, which will play a major role in the Masters Games, will be held at the Adelaide Aquatic Centre. I am delighted with the enrolments for the Masters Games. At the close of registration on 18 September, some 7 272 people had applied to enter the Masters Games. This will be the largest of this sort of masters festival ever to be held in the world, and in terms of numbers it will be second only to events such as the Seoul Olympics. That gives everyone an idea of the size and of the impact that these games are likely to have on South Australia, in the important masters or veterans area of sport. Indeed, from my point of view, this will provide a great fillip for sport in this area, encouraging participation and enjoyment by people who are over 25 or 30, depending on the category of age that is designated for the veterans' level.

Some 42 events will be conducted from 14 to 22 October. We are very satisfied with the interstate participation. Basically, we organised our finances on a break-even of above 2 000 participants—and so we are well above that, at 5 000 above that figure. We know that there will be over 2 000 interstate and overseas participants at the games, with 800 or so participants from Victoria, some 300 from New South Wales and 250 from Tasmania, as well as participants from Western Australia and Queensland, and a quite large contingent from the Northern Territory. We have surpassed our expectations with regard to gender balance as well. We wanted equal participation, and, as it has turned out, almost 4 000 men will be participating and 3 000 women are enrolled in the sports. We are very keen to see as many people as possible participating. Some members of this House have already indicated that they will participate. The Minister of Mines and Energy will participate in the swimming and the Premier and I will run a half marathon.

**Mr Tyler:** Some are too young.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** One or two of us are perhaps too young. Also, I think the member for Goyder has thrown his hat into the ring for the half marathon. It will be a very exciting period, and our catchcry for the Masters Games centres on the 'Come Alive' aspect. The period from 14 to 22 October with these veteran athletes in Adelaide will be very exciting for South Australia. From my point of view as Minister of Recreation and Sport, it promotes the festival side of sport and recreation, and it will encourage other people in our age bracket who are not participating in sport or recreation to do so. I look forward to participating, as I am sure do those other 7 000-odd athletes.

### CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services review claims made in booklets promoting the Government's crime prevention strategy that South Australia has lower crime rates than American States in view of information obtained by the Opposition which shows, for example, that the rate of break and entering offences in our State is 95 per cent higher than in the United States?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bright is out of order.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Those who do not want to listen do not want to learn. I refer to claims in the Government's crime prevention strategy booklet as follows:

Clearly it is nonsense to suggest that crime problems in the South Australian capital are approaching levels experienced in the United States . . .

It also states:

Our crime rates are well below those of United States cities of comparable size, let alone the so-called 'crime' cities.

These claims are completely contradicted by official figures the Opposition has received from the FBI through the Australian Institute of Criminology. These figures are the latest available and cover the year 1987. They show that in that year the rate of burglaries in the United States was 1 329.6 per 100 000 population. The South Australian figure for the equivalent period was 2 591.05 offences per 100 000 population—95 per cent higher than the American rate. In this period, 34 of the American States had a burglary rate less than half of South Australia's. In Nebraska, a State of similar size to our own, the rate was 847.9—about a third of South Australia's.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask members during the course of their explanations to be careful not to connect various statistics with remarks that obviously constitute debate.

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER:** The booklet to which the honourable member refers has in fact been very well received, as far as I am concerned, in my own electorate, and I get the very same information from other members with whom I have spoken. It is very clear that the community wants a lead in combating crime, together with the Police Force and the Government, and they have received this particular document with some degree of real feeling of relief that something is finally being done.

The information in the booklet, I am told, has been very carefully researched, and it has been researched by experts. I am not entirely sure that I would class anyone on the other side of this House as an expert. Indeed, if it came to asking a second-class expert and taking that person's word against the Opposition's, I would still know whom to ask. But this particular set of information was compiled by someone who has an Australia-wide reputation for excellence in this field.

I am not sure to what extent (I could not tell from listening to him) the honourable member was comparing City of Adelaide figures with average State figures in the United States, including rural-based States with very small urban concentrations, but that will be checked out when I read *Hansard*. Since the honourable member has now raised this issue, I suppose I have no choice but to go back and ask my officers to check it out, and bring back the usual put-down to the House to let the honourable member know that he was wrong. It happens so frequently nowadays that I get scurrilous rubbish raised by members opposite. I have to take it away, have it carefully researched, bring it back later, and members opposite have achieved their objective. They have obtained a quick headline and are hoping that the rebuttal of the headline is nowhere near the same size. It is a particularly sick way to run an Opposition but, as we get closer and closer to the election, I guess we have to expect more and more of it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Minister to order.

## TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

**Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward):** Will the Minister of Transport indicate to the House how many applications have been received by the State Transport Authority for the over 60s transport concession entitlement known as the Senior's Card.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the member for Hayward for her question, and I acknowledge the role that she played in the introduction of this concession to some of our senior citizens. Over a number of years the member for Hayward has taken a keen interest not only in our senior citizens but in the mature aged who are unemployed. I think that everybody in Adelaide who works in those areas will appreciate the successful effort that the member for Hayward has put in.

I am pleased to inform the House that the applications have been coming in at the rate of about 1 500 per working day. I listened with a great deal of respect to my colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction when he was commenting on the success of HomeStart. I can tell him that the Senior's Card is at this stage beating him two to one. I am very thrilled about that.

The volume of applications indicates that there clearly was an unmet need in the community. I am pleased, together with the member for Hayward, to have played a part in meeting that need. I think it is important that that be acknowledged. Despite the large numbers of people who have applied, the STA has assured me that the cards will be posted in the very near future to applicants to enable them to use the concession after 1 November, the date from which, the Government has announced, the concession will apply.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MARINELAND

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I apologise that I do not have multiple copies of this statement, because it is in response to a question that was asked earlier in Question Time. The following is in response to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about a meeting which allegedly took place between the Director of the Department of State Development and Technology, Mr Rod Hartley, his Deputy Director, Sandra Eccles, and the Abels.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I did not ask the question. *Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Despite the fact that I have warned the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that next time he was disruptive he would be named, I will overlook it, but I suggest that, if he is agitated about a remark that was made in the course of the Minister's explanation, the proper course open to him is to seek leave at a later stage to make a personal explanation. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I am anticipating events. I am anticipating the person who will be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the next few months. I am advised by both the Director for State Development and Technology and the Deputy Director for State Development and Technology that a meeting did take place on 8 February 1989. Discussions were held between the parties mentioned and the Abels were advised by the officers present that it was the view of Zhen Yun that the marineland component of the project was not viable in the long term.

One of the factors leading to that conclusion was rising community concern regarding the taking of dolphins from the wild and keeping them in captivity. At no time was any perceived union pressure raised by departmental officers. Mr Hartley reiterated to the Abels that Cabinet had in fact continued its support of the original licences but it was Zhen Yun that decided not to proceed.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I move: That the House at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 11 October at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act 1981. Read a first time.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I move: *That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## Explanation of Bill

This Bill extends the expiry date of the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act 1981 from 31 December 1989 to 31 December 1992. This will permit land acquisitions under the Act to continue until the end of 1992 in line with the expected completion date of the River Torrens Linear Park and flood mitigation scheme.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 repeals section 4 of the Act and substitutes the new expiry date of 31 December 1992.

**Mr OSWALD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act 1946. Read a first time.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I move: *That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## Explanation of Bill

The Dog Fence Act 1946 provides for the maintenance of the dog-proof fence. The body responsible for the maintenance and inspection of the fence under the Act is the Dog Fence Board. This Bill seeks to make two changes to the institutions or persons that can nominate members of the board. At present one member is nominated by the

Vertebrate Pest Control Authority. The responsibilities of that authority were taken over by the Animal and Plant Control Commission under the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act of 1986. This Bill formally recognises that change. It replaces the right of nomination of the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority with that of the new commission.

At present a second member of the board is nominated by the Minister from a panel selected by local dog fence boards created under the Act. On 4 March 1986 the then Minister of Lands, the Hon. R.K. Abbott, undertook to give that right of nomination to an appropriate incorporated association established to represent local dog fence boards. The Far West Dog Fence Boards Association Incorporated has since been incorporated for that purpose, and this Bill seeks to give that body a right of nomination in place of the existing right of the Minister.

The Bill also makes one consequential amendment to the Act and corrects an unrelated cross-reference in section 41, subsection (2) of the Act.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 amends section 6 of the principal Act. Section 6 deals with the membership of the Dog Fence Board. Clause 3 substitutes the Animal and Plant Control Commission for the Vertebrate Pests Control Authority as the body entitled to nominate one member of the board. It also specifies the Far West Dog Fence Boards Association Incorporated as another body entitled to nominate one member to the board, in place of the existing rights of the Minister to nominate one such member from a panel selected by local dog fence boards.

Clause 4 is a consequential amendment to section 11 of the principal Act. As the right of local boards to nominate to a panel is being replaced by the direct nomination to the Dog Fence Board by the Far West Dog Fence Boards Association Incorporated under clause 3, the reference in section 11 of the principal Act to local boards is no longer necessary.

Clause 5 amends an incorrect cross-reference in section 41 of the principal Act. This change is unrelated to the amendments in clauses 3 and 4.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 974.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I wish to spend some time today on the subject of the timber industry and the importation of rainforest timbers. I commend the Government on the courageous decision which has been taken not to use tropical rainforest timber in the construction of a velodrome.

I understand that, depending on Federal funding in other things, the alternatives are concrete or timbers other than tropical rainforest timbers to create the competitive surface of the velodrome. Of course concrete can be exposed to the weather, but timber cannot. Unless suitable arrangements can be made for placing a roof on the structure, timber is not a practical alternative. However, it has to be said that a decision has been taken by the Government not to use

tropical rainforest timber, and I commend the Government for that.

The use of tropical rainforest timber and the depletion of tropical forests has been of some concern to me for a number of years. I wrote to the Federal Minister for the Arts, Sports, the Environment, Tourism and Territories, Graham Richardson, earlier this year in the following terms:

Dear Graham, I am unsure what powers the Federal Government may or may not possess to curtail the importation of rainforest timbers from South-East Asia, the Pacific and elsewhere, but I would most certainly urge you to take all possible action to phase out the importation of non-plantation rainforest timber as soon as practically possible.

In response to that letter I received a letter from the assistant secretary of the Minister's Department, Andy Turner, which says in part:

In June 1986 the Government provided \$22.25 million for the establishment of the National Rainforest Conservation Program to implement a range of rainforest conservation initiatives in cooperation with the States and Territories. In November 1986 the Australian East Coast Temperate and Sub-Tropical Rainforest Parks of New South Wales were inscribed on the World Heritage List.

In 1987 the Government established the National Afforestation Program to encourage State and local governments, companies, community groups and landholders to increase investment in the establishment of hardwood plantations and land rehabilitation and degradation control through afforestation. The Government allocated \$15 million for the program over its first three years.

In 1988 the Wet Tropics of Queensland was inscribed on the World Heritage List. As a result, regulations were made prohibiting without ministerial consent commercial forestry operations and controlling road construction within the area.

It can be seen from that that, within Australia, the Federal Government has taken every possible step to ensure that tropical rainforests have not been depleted by logging and, to all intents and purposes, that activity has stopped. The Federal Government has gone a little beyond that and has gone some way down the track to discouraging the importation of rain forest timbers from overseas, and down the track of encouraging foreign Governments to cease logging tropical rainforests. The letter went on:

The Prime Minister donated \$250 000 to the Fundacao Mata Virgem in support of its efforts to establish a 180 000 square kilometre ecological reserve in the Xingu region of the Amazon Basin; the Minister for Employment, Education and Training announced the allocation of \$1 million to assist with the establishment and maintenance of the Institute of Tropical Rainforest Studies in Cairns; and the Australian Construction Services is reviewing conditions of tender and contract for the use of old growth rainforest timber in construction projects for Commonwealth Government departments.

So, it can be seen from those measures that Australian Governments at all levels, including this one, have given every indication that no funding spent by this Government will be associated with the importation of rainforest timbers. The letter further states:

The Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories is letting a consultancy to study the impact of Australia's involvement in the tropical timber industry and options for increasing tropical forest protection. Australia, along with the major consuming and producing nations of tropical timbers, is a member of the International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO). Australian membership provides an opportunity to contribute to the development of responsible forest management policies and practices and to encourage producing nations to pay greater attention to the environmental values of tropical forests, and to maintaining the ecological balance in the regions concerned.

That is, the regions of the tropical rainforests such as the Amazon Basin, Congo Basin and others. The letter continues:

During the ITTO Council meeting held in Yokohama, Japan in November 1988 the permanent committee on reforestation and forest management earmarked funding for major studies of the conservation status of tropical timbers used in trade and the conservation concerns associated with the diversification of species extracted from tropical forests for timber use. More recently

ITTO has decided to send a mission to assess 'sustainable utilisation and conservation of tropical forests and their genetic resources as well as maintenance of the ecological balance in Sarawak, Malaysia, taking fully into account the need for proper and effective conservation and development of tropical timber forests with a view to ensuring their optimum utilisation'.

That is not quite an end to tropical forest logging in Malaysia, but it will ensure that when rainforests are logged they are logged, as far as possible, on a sustainable basis. The Malaysian Government is aware of international concerns, I am assured, including those within Australia, and the Malaysian Government and the Government of Sarawak are aware of the social and environmental effects of logging in their territory. I believe that the Australia Government has taken all possible steps to ensure the winding down of the importation of tropical timbers.

I wish to turn to some of the reasons for that step, for the courageous decision being taken by the South Australian Government in not going ahead with the tropical timbers in the velodrome, and for the Australian Government trying to encourage foreign exporters of rain forest timbers to desist from logging their areas of tropical rainforest. The effect of rainforest on the atmosphere is well known. The amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere at the moment is 2.5 million million tonnes. That has doubled since 1750 (since the industrial revolution), and one of the major natural mechanisms for absorbing that carbon dioxide and mitigating the greenhouse effect is quite clearly the enormous biomass of the tropical forests.

It is interesting to review what is happening at present in tropical forests of the world, and I want to skate briefly over a number of areas of contention. The Malaysian Government in the past has not been overly attentive to some of the details Senator Richardson referred to, and around the Atang Bari Dam project in Sarawak 3 000 tribal people were displaced to make way for that dam. Other dams such as at Pelagus and Bakun will displace another 17 000 people. I believe that logging in Sarawak has turned the corner; that traditional tribal groups such as the Penan, Kelabit, Kayon, Marut and Iban may have their territories protected as a result of the kind of pressure Senator Richardson and his colleagues in other developed countries are beginning to bear on them. Those areas of Malaysian rainforest contain a number of animal species which are both rare and extremely threatened. Included among those and listed by the International Wildlife Fund (IWF) as endangered are the following: the two-horned rhinoceros; proboscis monkey; silvered langur; and the banded langur.

In the vulnerable species category, again from the IWF, are the following: the clouded leopard; orang utan; Borneo gibbon; maroon langur; sun bear; barking deer, sambhar, which is another deer; and the bearded pig. A number of other species, including local otters and various species of the cat family are rare, as is the slow loris and the western tarsier. All those species are threatened in one degree or another by the existence of logging in Sarawak.

Sarawak, of course, is only one island, and the adjacent country of Indonesia is a country of 11 000 islands. I dare say that Sarawak is larger than most, but the enormous biological diversity of that region indicates just how imperative it is that the logging of tropical rainforest should stop—and stop forthwith. I wish to turn to the question of what countries such as Australia and Governments such as this one might do to avoid further damage to the tropical rainforests. It is clear that people on the spot (local people) can take some action, but if you are using a blowpipe against a bulldozer your chances are not very great. I suggest that the kind of action taken by Senator Richardson is the way to go. We need to call for a moratorium on logging of all

kinds in the tropical rainforests. It is not overly optimistic to do that, because Brazil, under President Jose Sarney, last year declared a moratorium on the clearance of rainforests for agricultural forestry and mining purposes in the Amazon Basin.

Indeed, the International Tropical Timber Organisation meeting in Yokohama two years ago established an agreement under the auspices of the United Nations Convention on Trade and Development which was designed to limit that trade. Further, 41 nations signed that treaty and they agreed as part of the treaty to work towards the principles of sustainable utilisation, the conservation of genetic resources and the maintenance of ecological balance in the world's tropical rainforests.

It seems to me that action could go a little further. The developed nations, through their participation in the Multilateral Development Banks such as the World Bank, the InterAmerican Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the African Development Bank, can give the lead to less developed countries and encourage them to pursue policies of husbandry in their tropical forests and, hopefully in the final analysis, to provide and present them with alternatives to logging so that those countries will not be impoverished by their decision to abandon the logging of their tropical forests.

Australia contributes about \$250 million a year to the World Bank and has 2.5 per cent of the voting power on that body. The 2.5 per cent is not huge, but it does give Australia some say in international forums and some means by which it can influence the behaviour of other developed countries. In countries such as Britain, Germany and Scandinavia, Governments are urged to and indeed they have a statutory obligation to screen the impact of development projects as they are presented to the Government for review.

The United States Congress has already directed its delegate on the World Bank (it has a 20 per cent vote) to consider the environment and future of native peoples in making bank loans for the purposes of development. It is my view that Australia through its delegate on the World Bank (with its 2.5 per cent vote) should do the same.

There are other solutions to this problem. In Australia we need to turn more and more to the use of substitutes for tropical rainforests if we are to avoid placing developing countries into a position where they have to sell their heritage and the heritage of their native peoples in order to survive. We need to present them with economic alternatives, but we also need in Australia to provide substitutes for tropical rainforests, and I submit that there are substitutes.

Our own South Australian scrimber is an excellent substitute for structural timbers and an excellent replacement for tropical hardwoods in many applications. In the areas of cabinet making and the production of ply, 75 per cent of rainforest timber used in Australia is imported. The species imported by cabinetmaking and ply industries are meranti, Pacific maple, Philippine mahogany, and a whole series of species from the area to our north, namely, Ramin, Kapur, Keruing, Seraya and Lavan.

Australia's major sources of tropical rainforest in the past have been Malaysia, which has supplied 65 per cent of our imports, the Philippines, which has supplied 17 per cent, with minor amounts coming from Papua New Guinea and Indonesia. It is my view that if Australia can both discourage the importation of those timbers and encourage substitutes we may go some way towards remedying the enormous problems facing tropical rainforests in our world.

There are a number of species in the Australian rainforests capable of being grown in plantations, and among

them I list Queensland maple; black bean, a rainforest species; silver oak, which is a rather more widespread species; tulip oak; Queensland walnut; silver ash and red cedar. All those species can be cultivated by underplanting them beneath cover species such as pines, acacias and eucalypts, and provided that those species have the ability to adapt to seral, namely, conditions between sclerophyll and rainforests, as indeed they do lend themselves to this application.

Indeed, hoop pine is a tropical species already grown extensively in plantations throughout Queensland. It seems to me that the task facing Australia and other developed countries is clear. We need to use the economic muscle of developed countries through the Multilateral Development Banks to force, if necessary, developing countries not to continuing logging those areas. One has to ask: what about the developing countries themselves? What about legislation in those countries which contribute 80 per cent of the carbon dioxide to make good the balance by planting tropical forests in developing countries?

Something seems to have happened to the principle of 'polluter pays'. It seems that those countries which use the tropical rainforest timbers and which provide the markets for those third world Governments should have an obligation not only to stop importing but also to replace the forests and repair some of the damage being done. Why should people in less developed countries keep paying for the extravagance of the developed world? It seems to me that we need to move into the United Nations for a convention which puts the responsibility for the greenhouse effect clearly where it belongs, that is, on the industries and power generating authorities and other instrumentalities in the developed first world. We should not lumber the third world and developing countries with the obligation to remedy the greenhouse effect on their own.

As a political issue, it seems to me that the exploitation of tropical rainforests will become the whaling issue of the 1980s and 1990s. Whilst in the 1960s and 1970s Greenpeace and other organisations were railing against the activities of the International Whaling Commission, in future the tropical timbers organisation (ITTO) will come under similar pressure, and so it should. In my view, the importation of rainforest timber should not just be discouraged but it should be banned forthwith. The step taken by the Minister in this State in deciding not to use those timbers on the velodrome is an important first step.

Timber importers, architects and builders need to look for alternatives. We need to promote products such as scrimber and to promote the plantation of tropical hardwoods to replace those forests, imports and undo some of the damage which has been done to the world's tropical rainforests.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan):** I call on the member for Morphett.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Information technology as part of both the public and private sectors is an area of vital importance. It is particularly important in the public sector because of the enormous cost involved in the implementation of the hardware, the software, and getting the programs up and running. As long as I can remember since I have been reading the Auditor-General's Report—this goes back about 10 years—the Auditor-General has consistently criticised the acquisition of computers and their implementation and management by various levels within the Public Service.

The time has been reached when Parliament should start to get more involved. The Public Accounts Committee made some excellent reports going back to the late '70s when we

had the Flinders Medical Centre debacle and the acquisition there which went terribly wrong as a result of incorrect advice being passed up to Cabinet. There have been other reports right through to the one which the Public Accounts Committee has just brought down this year. All along the Auditor-General has consistently criticised the level of advice being passed up from middle management to senior management and through to Cabinet.

We cannot really criticise Cabinet too much about the decisions taken, because the decisions are based on advice being passed up to Cabinet. However, the time has come when the Parliament will have to back the Auditor-General and start to take note of some of his comments. I refer to some of his comments. Under the State Services line, I asked the Minister several questions. I refer to the broad objectives of the State Services Department, as follows:

To operate the centre—

referring to the Government Computing Centre—

as a business-like and customer orientated organisation to provide Government agencies with efficient and cost effective services for the . . . provision of consultancy and project management services.

From that statement alone I would have thought that the department had a responsibility to provide consultancy, advice and project management services; and I believe that that should be the case. However, when I asked the Minister to comment on that and cited the examples in the Auditor-General's Report, she immediately said that I was on the wrong track, that I was referring to the Motor Registration Division's computer and other departments' computers, and that really it was not her responsibility.

However, all those people in State Computing (the old Data Processing Board) who used to advise the Government are in the State Services Department and are advisers in their own right. If Cabinet makes a decision it obtains advice from the Government Management Board, which is receiving constant advice from the computer experts, yet mistakes are still being made. Mistakes might have been accepted in 1978 when we had the Flinders Medical Centre computer fiasco, but we are now entering the 1990s and the Auditor-General is still making the same comments; the same mistakes are still being made. When will the Government get its act together and do something about it? The Auditor-General's Report states:

In last year's report, it was suggested that it might be appropriate for the Government to undertake an independent management review (rather than a technical review) to determine whether there was any need for a change in direction in the information technology strategy for the public sector. The report indicated that such a review would seem to be relevant at a time when the State Computing Business Unit was looking to upgrade its facilities with an estimated first stage funding requirement of \$5.3 million in 1988-89.

Audit's concern for a review was driven by changes in technology; and that the absence of a policy framework makes it difficult to ensure that the most appropriate investment decisions are being made.

That is not a good commentary on middle and upper management experts who advise the Government. The Auditor-General continues:

In November last year, the Government Management Board informed the State Services Department (then the Department of Services and Supply) that it could not support a proposed upgrade of the unit's facilities at an estimated cost of \$9 million. Subsequent information stated that the board requested an interim solution be sought to the unit's immediate capacity problem, pending clarification of large agency requirements and a better understanding of computing direction.

The State Services Department implemented an interim solution which provided for the leasing of an IBM processor until 30 June 1990 for \$1.4 million, and for the purchase of additional peripheral equipment at a cost of \$1.4 million.

This was approved by Cabinet, no doubt on the advice of officers in the State Services Department, who would have advised the Government Management Board, which then made its decision; and then, I guess in good faith, Cabinet gave it its blessing. But what do we find as a result of the assessment and implementation of the interim solution? The Auditor-General's Report states:

In previous reports and earlier in this report, I have stressed the importance of quality of information for decision making purposes. In that context, there are several aspects of the proposal which are of concern.

The Government has implemented it, and already the Auditor-General is saying that there are areas of concern. He states:

First, the proposal makes no mention that usage of the unit's facilities averages only about 50 per cent of total available capacity outside the prime time period . . .

Secondly, that in the prime time period (9.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. Monday to Friday), considerable capacity is taken up by on-line inquiry of files by Government agencies; and by program development and program testing by staff at both the unit and at Government agencies.

Thirdly, the proposal does not take into account the cost to the Government of investment income forgone on funds accumulated by the unit . . . which are to be applied to the acquisition of new equipment.

Finally, the proposal does not draw attention to the fact that the interim solution . . . is not cost effective and shows a potential net cost of \$400 000, which could be as high as \$1.8 million if no additional revenues are generated during the period of the lease.

Already, on that particular project alone, the Auditor-General is saying that insufficient advice has been given. I will now read sections of the Auditor-General's Report concerning the whole question of advice which, if incorrect, naturally leads to incorrect decisions. Referring to the interim solution, it states:

It also seems . . . that the decision maker (in this case Cabinet) should be given the opportunity to weigh up whether it would wish to support another course of action . . . and be advised of the financial, economic and any other implications of doing so.

I would have thought that the general procedure would be to ensure that Cabinet is given all the advice. Clearly, the Auditor-General is of the view that Cabinet does not receive advice. The report continues:

That opportunity would seem to be important if the decision maker is to be satisfied that the greatest use practicable is being made of the existing capital investment; and be satisfied also on the general efficiency of on-line inquiry usage given that the unit has little or no control over the number of terminals in the public sector, or the extent or timing of their access to the unit's facilities.

I now turn my attention to equipment in the Department of Transport. The Auditor-General, referring to lack of management and the need for competent managers, states:

The appointment of competent project managers, who can drive each of these projects towards a clear set of objectives, is essential if the projects are to be completed on time and within budget.

I hope that the Government Management Board realises that these comments have been made over and over in previous Auditor-General's Reports. Referring to the Austpay system, which I believe is a good example of where advice is not getting to the decision-makers, the Auditor-General's Report states:

In 1984, approval was given to an expenditure of \$125 000 for the acquisition of a computerised payroll/personnel system, including package costs and modification and education costs. A South Australian product Austpay was subsequently purchased, which incorporated a payroll function and was seen to provide an excellent base from which to develop the varied requirements of personnel management systems. The Austpay system was to replace the computerised common pay system.

A preliminary review of this system by my officers in 1986 raised concern about a number of matters, including a substantial overrun in the authorised expenditure level of \$125 000, an apparent absence of a cost-benefit study and limitations in payroll costing information, resulting in larger agencies using separate

'in-house' systems for that purpose. The personnel function of the system was not being used.

So, in 1988 it was reviewed. The report continues:

The board's report of October 1988 [two years later] confirmed the earlier audit concerns. In particular, the report identified: difficulty in determining an accurate total cost of acquiring, developing and implementing the Austpay system in the 30 agencies at that time. From the fragmented information available, the report put the cost at about \$2.5 million.

In 1984, the cost was \$125 000, and in 1988 the Auditor-General is talking about \$2.5 million.

The Auditor-General then lists in the report matters of concern with respect to the quality of information on which the decision was made in 1984 to acquire and implement the Austpay system. The fact is that the Auditor-General was concerned, and justifiably so. The Auditor-General then concludes:

In seeking those views, I pointed out that it was Audit's view that development (including the acquisition of hardware and software) is being driven, in many cases, by computer oriented rather than management oriented people, and from the middle management level; and that it once again brings into focus the need for senior management to become better informed and satisfied (in a non-technical way) about the need and the benefits to be gained from data processing developments in their agency. I also stressed the need for greater emphasis to be given to attracting to the data processing area people with management skills and practical 'field' experience, particularly in management accounting and business systems.

Had such comments been made in, say, the Auditor-General's Report of 1978, when computer acquisition in the Public Service was more in its infancy, that would have been understandable. However, with statements like that in the Auditor-General's Report at a time when we are moving into the 1990s, we have to start questioning the level of competency of the Government. By now, the members of Cabinet have had ample opportunity to obtain advice. Certainly not too many people in Cabinet would know a lot about computers; I do not criticise them for that, as it is a specialised field. However, if Cabinet is not getting the right advice, and with the Auditor-General putting statements like that in his report, the time has come for Cabinet to say, 'Stop, let us have a close look at the level of advice we are getting.'

Clearly, no Government can continue to keep making these mistakes with acquisitions, based on incorrect advice. It is an historical thing; it has not just developed in the last few years. Initially, we would have said that the Government should get its act together in relation to the department involved. We cannot say that any longer. We have an incompetent Government which has been warned year after year by the Auditor-General. It has obviously chosen to turn a blind eye to the matter, either through ignorance or because it does not understand how important the computer philosophy is—or is it that it is just disinterested and does not understand? I am not sure which one it is.

In relation to an area of expenditure which can get out of control and cost taxpayers millions of dollars, as has occurred in the past and as will occur in the future if the situation is not corrected, if nothing else came out of the Estimates Committees, it certainly came home to me that the Government has been very lax in its attitude toward keeping a handle on computer acquisitions and on the situation pertaining to computer philosophy in the public sector.

There is potential for Austpay to become a scandal. I would like to think that some time immediately after the election the PAC might decide to have another look at Austpay and to see where it is going. The PAC put a lot of work into the last report that was presented here a couple of months ago and I commend the committee for that;

however, it has a duty to the Parliament to go back and have a hard look at the management sector and what it is doing with computers. It must also have a hard look at what the Auditor-General really meant by those comments that I quoted, where he said that he believes that middle management should be driven by people who understand the real world out there in management and that we should not rely entirely on those people who are experts in the computing field.

I have some sympathy for the Government, because Ministers take advice from their departmental experts. If one is not a computer buff, one has to listen to advice. However, we have people in the Auditor-General's Department who are experts in this field of management using computers. What they are saying is not the same as what the other alleged computer experts are saying, who are advising the Government Management Board. A competent Government would pull these matters together, for the sake of the taxpayer. I implore the Government to do so.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I move: That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour):** I move: That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I refer to the efforts of the Government in respect of law and order and to the announcements made recently by the Attorney-General in relation to a \$10 million program to deal with crime prevention, to be undertaken over the next five years. In recent days, crime prevention matters have been subject to a fair bit of debate in this House. Part of the program will involve a \$1.364 million grant, to be made available this financial year and allocated to agencies and community groups.

Projects to be sponsored include home security and safety programs for aged people; recreational activities for street kids; computer mapping of crime data, to identify high risk areas; school watch programs, to secure school buildings; extension of the blue light program; and the police deputies club, a program to promote crime prevention philosophies in primary schools.

Various organisations in my electorate have already applied for some of this grant money. I hope that I can justify to Parliament the need these people have to obtain that money. It is not so long ago that some new trust home areas were established in my electorate. To those areas come a group of people who are not used to the community in which they have been put. They are also often very poor. For various reasons, from time to time we get ghettos, where single parents, the poorest people of all in our community, are grouped together. Often this grouping occurs in areas where there are already established homes. In one area in my electorate there are some very well established middle class homes and older trust homes and then some brand-new homes. We find that the youngsters congregate in those areas, finding themselves in a very isolated position.

People in these situations are isolated in the sense that they do not have the wherewithal, the money, to integrate into the community that surrounds them. They might find themselves unable to utilise the clubs and sporting facilities that are available in the community. I refer specifically to clubs, and so on, in my area, like the lifesavers clubs,

baseball clubs, football clubs, hockey clubs, the little athletics club, and indeed the youth clubs, where a lot of very good work is done.

All of these clubs require that the parents of children have a certain amount of capital to enable the children to participate in their activities and to enter into the spirit of things. So, where we find a group of teenagers, or even younger children, from seven through to 17 years, who are unable to produce the \$200 to buy a uniform or the \$150 to pay club fees to join in these community activities, we find people with time on their hands congregating together and forming, if you like, a small society of their own in which they become isolated from the rest of society.

This situation is not unique to Australia: it can be seen in many other countries. I was pleased to hear the Attorney-General say he had taken the opportunity recently to visit France and look at the Bonne Maison system of crime prevention. That system concentrates very much on youth in the provincial cities of France. It very much involves community cooperation, and that cooperation has not yet been developed in South Australia. I hope that this initial grant of \$1.364 million will be the start of putting together something that will be very useful in terms of crime prevention in South Australia.

Councils and community organisations presently are reluctant to enter into the activities of crime prevention. On the one hand, local councils say it is a State matter and has nothing to do with them, provided they look after their drains, collect the rubbish, cut down the trees and attend to normal council activities: the remainder is really a social responsibility of the State Government. I have found that councils have been reluctant to pick up the tab and make application for grant money in order to assist in crime prevention because they fear they will be left with that responsibility for all time if at some subsequent time the State Government decides to pull out and not provide the sort of finance that is available at the moment.

Similarly, some community organisations have specific objectives and have no wish to widen those objectives. I know of one church organisation for which the Department for Community Welfare provides a grant for its youth welfare work—and which does a good job—but it is reluctant to move into this area of crime prevention. Crime is not easy to control. It is becoming a closed society. Many of these children do not like authority. If they are spoken to by a police officer, it is seen as a badge of honour rather than something of which they ought to be ashamed. It is something about which they go and boast to their mates.

It takes special training and a very special kind of youth worker to break into this sort of society and become involved in crime prevention, which is so necessary. Unfortunately, when youngsters are left to their own devices, they often become involved in drug taking, and I refer specifically to marijuana and alcohol. Some even resort to the use of heroin, and that is evident by the discarded needles seen in the streets. If only the Federal system provided the sort of money that is provided in France, we could improve things greatly.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I refer to the proposed relocation of the Northfield Agricultural Research Centre to the Waite Institute site, in the middle of a residential area. There is no doubt that a double standard is being applied by the Government. The Government knows it, the community is aware of it and all Ministers who have been involved in the project from the time the relocation was suggested are fully aware of the double standards that are applied. The suggestion that a project, which will cost mil-



lions, will not have an effect upon the quality of life of the people in a residential area is quite false. Any suggestion that this will not impinge upon the quality of life of the community in the area around the Waite Institute reflects a double standard.

A community hall was to be established by a church group in the district of the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. Kym Mayes)—a residential area. The Government used section 50 of the Planning Act and the power of Cabinet to make sure that that hall would not be constructed. It would have been valued perhaps at a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and that is a lot more than it would have been worth. It was rejected, in the main, on the argument of increased traffic and the number of people who would have come into that residential area. However, they would not have been there on five days of the week.

The facility would have been used only on infrequent occasions by between 200 and 250 people, and from 7.30 p.m. onwards. In all probability, it would not have been used during ordinary daylight hours through to evening, except during daylight saving hours. But the Government proposes to relocate to the Waite Institute site a project originally stated to be worth \$30 million, with multi-storey buildings, quarantine facilities and research facilities involving chemicals.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** And chemical storage.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** In particular, it would involve an increase in the number of motor vehicles in an area that is already facing a very serious traffic problem. The member for Victoria rightly points out that chemical storage is involved, and there will also be machinery storage, which has taken place in recent times to a small degree; the suggestion was that the machinery be kept north of Adelaide and brought to Waite only when required.

I wonder how long that promise would stand if this transfer or relocation took place. The Liberal Party has clearly stated that the Waite research facilities should in the main stay at Northfield with the piggery going out into the country areas and very little, if any, going to Waite. No doubt this Government will try to speed up some of the relocation to Waite so that it can say, 'It is there now. Try to shift it.'

Waite is not in the centre of a marginal seat. The whole of the State now knows that if Government action favourable to a community is required, it needs to be in a marginal seat. That is where the double standards come in. No member of the Government would be prepared to have a project worth \$5 million, let alone up to \$30 million, placed in the middle of his residential areas. The new project will have three-storey buildings in the middle of a residential area and there will be extra motor cars.

The Waite Neighbourhood Residents' Association asked the Minister for Environment and Planning for an environmental impact statement. They asked for a meeting to discuss the matter. The Minister refused that appointment. She would not even give them the time to talk about it. This is the so-called open Government and the so-called amiable Minister.

**Mr Tyler:** She is a very good Minister.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** As the member for Fisher said, she is excellent for marginal seats. I should like to refer to some aspects of the letter, dated 25 September, which I received yesterday in response to a letter that I sent to the Minister many weeks ago. She says that she has decided that an environmental impact statement is not required. She went on to say:

The Waite campus is surrounded on three sides by the residential suburbs of Myrtle Bank, Netherby and Urrbrae.

The Minister admits that it is residential. She did not admit that some of the work would also take place at Urrbrae, which takes in other suburbs, one of which will just touch on Unley, and that might stir up a few people there because it might be only 50 votes which count in the end. The Minister says that the campus has been extensively developed. And they want to put another huge project there. She refers to an agricultural research facility when talking about the development.

In the next paragraph the Minister said that the area is zoned specifically for the continuous and further development of land for education and research activities provided its open space and rural character are maintained. It will be impossible to maintain its open space and rural character if a project costing millions of dollars is established there. Yet the Minister says there is no need for an environmental impact statement on that project.

The Minister went on to say that in addition some small amounts of commonly available home garden chemicals may be employed from time to time but this also will not present a hazard. I have to say that a few years ago we never worried about people smoking alongside of others. We did not know that it was a hazard. Now we know that it is a health hazard whether one smokes individually or is a passive smoker and cops it from someone else. The Minister admits that people in her department are investigating to see whether there is any problem with toxic spray trespass; in other words, the drift of toxic sprays.

That will affect home gardeners and agriculturists, particularly in intensive cultivation areas, as well as Waite. She says that there is no worry. But there is a worry, because the Minister has got her department looking at it. Officers are talking with people involved in agriculture and those people are worried about the regulations that may come down. My point is that neither this Minister nor any one of us in this place knows the dangers. We do not know what harm we have already done to ourselves or to others when we use these chemicals. It is disgraceful of the Minister to say, 'Do not worry about it. It is no problem.'

In her letter, the Minister said that there is a problem which includes traffic. She says that the Mitcham council has had its traffic officer look at the problem. She admits that there is a problem, but says, 'Do not worry, this honourable Minister'—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** It is appropriate that I am given the last opportunity today to speak in the grievance debate. Some of my colleagues may become bored, particularly members on the other side of the House, when I start to talk about law and order issues. During Question Time today, I listened to the member for Light in his attempts to disparage and discredit the documentation put out by the Attorney-General's Department regarding law and order issues in this State. I suggest to the Parliament and to the community at large that the Commissioner of Police, David Hunt, would not put his name to a foreword to a document which illustrates the incidence of crime and what the Government intends to do if he did not believe it.

The Commissioner of Police is an honourable person who I suggest would have read this document before putting his name to it. For the member for Light to attempt to discredit the Commissioner of Police by inference is absolutely outrageous. It is not the first time that we have seen attempts by the Opposition to discredit senior public servants who have no opportunity to appear in this place and defend

themselves. Gutless, spineless attacks are made in this Parliament by Opposition members who do not have the intestinal fortitude to go outside the Parliament and make those allegations. Of course, that is not unusual. The member for Victoria aspires to be a future leader, and I will come back to that in the last minutes of the sitting of the Parliament, because I heard an interesting story yesterday.

I want to come back to the law and order issue. The Liberals know that this Government over the past seven years has addressed law and order issues. The issue is not what the Liberals would like it to be out in the community. We know, in the Government and in the Labor Party, that

the community now appreciates what the Government has been doing in terms of law and order issues.

I come back to the issue raised by the member for Light. He compared serious offences reported in Adelaide with similar sized cities in the United States. This document shows for the metropolitan statistical area the population of Adelaide is 1 023 517 and that is compared with serious offences in Birmingham, Buffalo, Honolulu, Jacksonville, Louisville, Memphis, Oklahoma and Rochester. I do not want to take up too much time, but I seek leave of the House to incorporate this statistical information in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

SERIOUS OFFENCES REPORTED IN ADELAIDE AND IN SIMILAR-SIZE CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES\*

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Population	Murder	Robbery	Serious Assault
Adelaide	1 023 517	14	613	962
Birmingham, Alabama	917 901	127	2 169	3 685
Buffalo, New York	987 572	40	1 736	3 216
Honolulu, Hawaii	832 614	36	985	915
Jacksonville, Florida	878 124	162	4 258	6 114
Louisville, Kentucky	963 727	65	2 220	2 329
Memphis, Tennessee	969 020	164	4 963	3 756
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	973 217	71	1 729	3 100
Rochester, New York	981 111	38	1 301	1 870

SOURCE: Adelaide data derived from South Australian Police Department regional summaries of offences reported. Figures for US cities are from the FBI Uniform Crimes Report.

\* Adelaide data is for 1988 calendar year; US data is for 1987 calendar year.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Similarly, I seek the leave of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* page 11 of this document under the heading, 'Rates of reported offences on which data is

assessed as comparable for each State: January-December 1988.'

Leave granted.

TABLE 1: RATES\* OF REPORTED OFFENCES ON WHICH DATA IS ASSESSED AS COMPARABLE† FOR EACH STATE: JANUARY-DECEMBER 1988

Offence	South Australia	New South Wales	Victoria	Queensland	Western Australia	Tasmania	Northern Territory	Australian Capital Territory	Australia
Murder	1.4	1.6	1.7	2.1	1.8	0.9	13.5	1.1	1.8
Attempted Murder	2.8	1.7	2.5	3.7	0.2	1.8	3.2	1.8	2.0
Conspiracy to Murder	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Manslaughter (excluding by driving)	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.4
Motor Vehicle Theft	1 336.1	1 707.3	1 314.3	729.4	1 535.6	443.0	1 476.81	1 241.0	1 341.7

SOURCE: Police Commissioner's Australian Crime Statistics (Sub-Committees, September 1988 and April 1989).

\* Murder, attempted murder, conspiracy to murder and manslaughter rates are offences reported per 100 000 people.

Motor vehicle theft rates are offences per 100 000 registered vehicles.

† Comparability levels assessed by the Police Commissioners Australian Crime Statistics Sub-Committee.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Quite clearly, this documentation put out by the Government, supported by the Premier, by the Attorney-General and by the Police Commissioner, would have been vetted very carefully in the knowledge that members of the Opposition would make every attempt to discredit it. We have seen it in the past. They have used and abused statistical information—and the member for Light has probably been one of the worst offenders over the years. That is supported by independent resources I have made available. If anyone looks back through *Hansard* he will see where I have taken particular note of things said by the member for Light, one of the few persons on the other side of the House who speaks on law and order issues.

Even the member for Mitcham will not talk about law and order. He wrote to me years ago and said that Neighbourhood Watch was not a viable proposition. They are his exact words. So much for the intellect of the member for Mitcham. The reality is that this Opposition wants to discredit the Government on these issues.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** As the member for Fisher says, law and order is a very real issue, and members opposite are trying to create unnecessary concern amongst elderly people in the community. My electorate has many elderly people; not the most elderly citizens per head of population, but it is close. I know from talking to these people that their

concerns are very real. They are concerned about people wandering around at night and concerned about having things stolen from their homes. And they are concerned quite properly. It is very cruel for members opposite for political reasons to whip up this fear as they did in 1979 with their stocking-mask bandit ads, suggesting that it was unsafe to walk the streets. None of us in this House would condone violence against the person or against one's family, so for members opposite to create this unnecessary concern in the minds of the public is quite outrageous.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed they are, as my colleague points out. The article on page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* quoting Janine Haines hit the nail on the head: the Leader of the Opposition is desperate to try to latch on to an issue. Members opposite are grabbing at straws, because the Leader knows that this is his last chance.

I am not a betting man, but I would like to lay a few dollars on the outcome of the next State election, and that is not bravado on my part. I believe very strongly that people such as I must assess what the community is saying. The community, particularly in my area, is very much aware of what this Government is doing on law and order.

I want to come back to what I said earlier in terms of a very interesting story I heard yesterday. Members will recall that in 1982, the then Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright), his driver and I were halfway to Mount Gambier when

Parliament was prorogued. A woman well known to me had rung me from Brighton a number of weeks before and said, 'Do you want to know what the election date is?' I said, 'I'm all ears—flapping like an elephant.' This woman imparted the information to me, I told Jack Wright and Jack Wright, as we all recall, revealed the election date.

The information I obtained yesterday that I want to pass on to Parliament is that a meeting of four very senior Liberal members was held in the Albert Park electorate this week. The reason is to unload the Leader of the Opposition as soon as the State election is over: that is what it is all about. Members opposite do not like it: they may laugh, but that is a fact. The meeting was held in my electorate, and time will tell whether I am correct, as I was in 1982. Well may the member for Victoria hang his head in shame!

Motion carried.

#### SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 4.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 11 October at 2 p.m.